National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FOREGROUNDING AND BACKGROUNDING IN OLD EAST SLAVIC: THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE

by

DAVID B. MATTHEWS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

SLAVIC LINGUISTICS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1990

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-64923-2

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: David B. Matthews

TITLE OF THESIS: Foregrounding and Backgrounding in Old East Slavic: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

David Matthews

202, 10803 - 47 AVE.,
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5J1

July 12, 1990

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled: FOREGROUNDING AND BACKGROUNDING IN OLD EAST SLAVIC: THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE, submitted by DAVID B. MATTHEWS in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS in SLAVIC LINGUISTICS.

Dr. Kyril T. Holden, Supervisor

Dr. T.M.S. Priestly

Dr. T.R. Carlton

Dr. Gary Prideaux

JUNE 15, 1990

To my wife Ann, who made it all possible.

ABSTRACT

Recent studies suggest that language codes narrative events differently from events or situations which do not narrate the story, but rather amplify or elaborate the narrative events. The discourse level coding ability of verbal aspect in Modern Russian has been suggested. Although in MR aspect is central to the verbal system, it plays a comparatively minor role in the substantially different verbal system of MR's medieval ancestor, Old East Slavic. The purpose of this study is to outline the means of discourse level coding in Old East Slavic.

The source text examined is the first portion of a late thirteenth century chronicle text, chosen because of its sufficient length and single authorship, its narrative nature, and its chronological position with respect to the development of the language.

The present study has been restricted to the preterite and perfect tenses, as well as participles, the Dative Absolute construction, and verbal aspect. It has been found that the Aorist tense is the principal tool encoding foreground events.

A three-level discourse level structure has been suggested by the analysis of the data. The middle level consists of background events or situations which enrich our understanding of the plot line events expressed on the foreground level. The Imperfect, Perfect, and Pluperfect tenses, the Past Active and Present Active Participles, and the Dative Absolute construction are all used on this level. The temporal relation of the background event or situation to the plot line events and the way it unfolds

along the time line (repeated event, durative event or state, result-state of a previous action, etc.) determine the particular category employed.

The Imperfect and Present Active Participle are used on the level of deep background, expressing events or situations which lack a temporal connection to the plot line events.

Exceptions to the preceding outline have been noted, some of which are motivated by temporal relations between events which override their discourse level significance, i.e their significance to the plot. Aspect was found to have only a lexical function, and did not correlate with grounding levels. Areas most in need of further investigation are identified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my advisor, Dr. Kyril Holden, who beleived in me; the Province of Alberta and my parents, my principal sources of financial support; the support staff of the Department of Slavic and East European Studies, for all their assistance; Dr. Lois M. Stanford, who first encouraged me to take up graduate study; my wife, who, in addition to her countless other contributions, proofread my final draft; and everyone else who helped and encouraged me in my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I THE NATURE OF FOREGROUNDING AND BACKGROUNDING

General Characteristics of Grounding 1
Means of Encoding and Levels 3
Modern Russian versus Old East Slavic 6
Summary 9

CHAPTER II THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE

Introduction 11
Genre and Age 12
Manuscripts 14
Language 15
The Corpus of Examples 19
Summary 20

CHAPTER III THE AORIST

Introduction 22
Form and Frequency 22
Meaning 23
Aspect and Grounding 26
Conclusions 29

CHAPTER IV THE IMPERFECT

Introduction 31
Form and Frequency 31
Meaning 33
Aspect 35
Grounding 36
Conclusions 37

CHAPTER IV THE SIMPLE PRETERITES OF БЫТИ

Introduction 38
The Three Types 39
Functions of the Aorist 42
Functions of the бъ-forms 46
Бъ-forms versus Imperfects 49
Conclusions 53

CHAPTER VI THE PLUPERFECT

Introduction 55
Aorist Plus l-participle 56

Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Theory....56
Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Practice....59
Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Other Possible Explanations....64
Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Negation....64
The Pluperfect in General in Foregrounding/ Backgrounding....66
Conclusions....68

CHAPTER VII THE PERFECT

Introduction: The Meaning of the Perfect....69
Reported Events....72
Negated Events....73
Narration versus Quotation....74
Aorist versus Perfect....75
Elliptic versus Full Perfect....79
Aspect....83
Foregrounding and Backgrounding....83
Conclusions....84

CHAPTER VIII THE PARTICIPLES AND DATIVE ABSOLUTES

Introduction....86
Past Active Participle: Form....87
Past Active Participle: Meaning....88
Present Active Participle: Form....90
Present Active Participle: Meaning....91
Dative Absolute: Form....93
Dative Absolute: Meaning....93
Aspectual Usage....98
Foregrounding and Backgrounding....99
Conclusions....100

CHAPTER IX CONCLUSIONS

Function of Verbal Forms in the GVC....101
Coordination of "Secondary" Predicates....104
Legitimacy of Grounding and its Implications....105
Foreground....107
Background....107
Aspect....110
Overall View....111
Historical Evolution....113
Conclusions....114

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY....115

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I. Simplex Preterite Forms of Быти 40

TABLE 2. Morphological Expression of Discourse Levels and Other Co-occurring Meanings in the Galician Chronicle 112

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF FOREGROUNDING AND BACKGROUNDING

General Characteristics of Grounding

Discourse studies of language suggest that narrative events are coded differently from events or situations which do not narrate the story, but rather amplify or elaborate the narrative events. In the literature, the former is referred to as foreground, the latter as background. Paul J. Hopper argues that this is an overt distinction in his discussion of the use of verbal aspect for encoding the foreground/background distinction.[1] The first point Hopper makes about the events on these two levels of discourse is their chronological relationship: foregrounded events succeed each other in the narrative in the same order as they do in the real world; background events are simultaneous with foregrounded ones: they usually amplify or comment on the foregrounded events.[2] It can certainly be argued that all events that

---

[1]Paul J. Hopper, "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse," Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 12: Discourse and Syntax (New York: Academic Press, 1979), p.213.
[2]Ibid., p.214.

do not belong on the level of foregrounding may be considered backgrounded events, as Russell S. Tomlin has done. In his study the level of *background information* includes propositions which perform any other function besides those performed by propositions on the levels of pivotal and foreground information, sometimes elaborating these latter propositions. Propositions on the *foreground information* level describe successive events in the narrative. Propositions on the level of *pivotal information* describe the most important events in the narrative.[3] This would mean that background events may take place prior to the time of the complete group of foregrounded events, and this naturally tends to preclude a great deal of significance of these events for the narrative. Unlike foreground clauses, which follow each other in succession in time, backgrounded events may be anywhere along the time axis, or, as Hopper points out, not on the time axis at all.[4]

The properties of foregrounded and backgrounded clauses allow for a great deal of variation in terms of the type of subject, the semantic type of the verb, and the distribution of given and new information. Hopper finds that foreground clauses have highly presuppositional subjects (i.e. given rather than new), and introduce new material in the predicates. Background clauses offer greater possibility of introducing new material in preverbal position and effecting a topic change. Foreground verbs tend to be punctual (though this is not a requirement) because they denote the discrete events of the narrative, and the need to express a sequence of events usually

---

[3]Russell S. Tomlin, "Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination," Text, 5:1-2, (1985), p.90. In the present study we may consider the levels of pivotal and foreground information conflated into one foregrounding level.
[4]Hopper, "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse," p.215.

demands completive verbs.[5] This is logical when one considers that the principal events of the narrative, the ones which advance the plot, tend to leave behind some kind of result which often precipitates another plot advancing event. Verbs which are not completive or punctual are less likely to leave some result (cf. the discussion on the meaning of the Aorist tense and the perfective aspect in Chapter 3.)

Hopper summarizes the main characteristics of foreground and background events (which he identifies with perfective and imperfective aspect) as follows. Foreground verbs are notable for: chronological sequencing; viewing the event as a whole, completive (telic) events; repetition of the same subject as in the preceding verb phrase; unmarked distribution of focus, i.e. presuppositional subject, assertion in predicate; human topics; dynamic events; event indispensible to the narrative; and realis. Background verbs are notable for: simultaneity or chronological overlapping; non-completive events; frequent changes of subject; marked focus, i.e. on subject, instrument, adverbial; a variety of topics including natural phenomena; stative, descriptive situations; a state or situation necessary to understand motives or attitudes, etc; and irrealis.[6] We would then expect to find some of these characteristics morphologically "built in" to the grammatical forms used consistently to convey these levels.

Means of Encoding and Levels

Hopper reports that tense/aspect morphology is quite commonly used to reflect this distinction: he describes at length how the contrast, realized in

---

[5]Tomlin, "Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination," p.215.
[6]Hopper, "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse," p.216.

French by the Imperfect and Simple Past tenses and in Russian by the imperfective and perfective aspects, encode backgrounding and foregrounding respectively.[7] Russian demonstrates particularly well how the backgrounding form (the past imperfective) is preferred when the action itself is highly presuppositional and focus is elsewhere in the sentence. Finally, Hopper demonstrates the use of word order to encode grounding in Old English and the use of voice for the same purpose in Malay and Tagalog. Thus there are many ways to encode foregrounding and backgrounding. For example, Larry B. and Linda K. Jones (1979) found tense, aspect, mode, particles, and repetition to mark various levels of grounding in six native American languages.

Jones and Jones distinguished more than two levels of grounding. Foregrounding is separated in this theory into a level of ordinary events, a level of backbone events, and the following two levels: the "peak" level, the "single most significant event or sequence of events",[8] and the level of "pivotal" or "significant" events.[9] The former was found to be marked by a wide variety of methods, even by a variety of methods in a single language. Among the methods used were: wordiness, a concentration of action and participants, tense shift (e.g., a switch to "dramatic present" in English), change in length or structure of constructions, change of vantage point, extended sentence length, or, in one case, a shift to a tense normally used for the deepest level of backgrounding.[10]

---

[7]Hopper, "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse," p.216-219.
[8]Larry B. Jones and Linda K. Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," Discourse Studies in Mesoamerican Languages, (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1979), p.6.
[9]Tomlin, "Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination," p.90, and Jones and Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," p.6.
[10]Jones and Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," pp.18-21.

The other level, the "pivotal" level of plot line events which are in some way more significant to the narrative than others was found by Jones and Jones to be marked with the same aspect as the "backbone" (level of foreground events deeper than pivotal) but with the addition of a specific particle, or with a doublet construction consisting of the mode-tense construction of the backbone level followed by the same event expressed by a different mode-tense combination, or repetition or paraphrase of a backbone event. In two languages which have no distinction between pivotal and backbone events, Jones and Jones find a level of ordinary events as distinguished from backbone events: here again the higher level (backbone) is distinguished from the lower level (ordinary events) simply by the addition of a particle or suffix to the lower level form. (Although Jones and Jones initially posit three levels of foregrounding, pivotal, backbone, and ordinary, besides the peak, none of the six languages in their study actually distinguishes all three levels.)[11] Thus we see that the two levels of foreground other than peak are closely linked grammatically. The two levels of backgrounding, significant background and ordinary background, are also formally similar in the same way as these foregrounding levels, but only in three of the four languages having a division of their backgrounding level.

Jones and Jones suggest that all languages may mark a peak level, and that if more than three levels of grounding are present, the preference appears to be for an additional level of foreground events.[12] Therefore if the background level is divided in two, then the language should have two foreground levels as well as a peak level: an overall five level structure.

---

[11] Jones and Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," p.22.
[12] Ibid., p.21-23.

Modern Russian vs. Old East Slavic

As far as the methods used by Russian are concerned, Hopper showed how this language uses aspect to mark grounding, as mentioned above. In addition, the morphological category of verbal adverb, or деепричастие, occurring in the syntactic category of dependent clause may be considered indicative of backgrounding. The present деепричастие is used to indicate an action occurring simultaneously with another action expressed by a finite verb in a main clause. The past деепричастие indicates an action preceding that of the main clause verb. The clause containing the деепричастие must have the same subject as the main clause, to which it may or may not be linked with a coordinating conjunction. In the sense that such clauses cannot exist independently, they must be considered dependent clauses. (Tomlin (1985) demonstrated the use of dependent clauses to code background information in English.)[13] For example, : "Я пишу письмо, сидя у себя в комнате," 'I am writing a letter, sitting in my room', and "Купив книгу, Иван стал читать его," 'Having bought a book, Ivan began to read it'. Whether it encodes a foregrounding level of "ordinary events" or a backgrounding level of "significant background", the деепричастие does encode a level of lesser significance than that of the perfective verbs in the main clause.

While Russian thus seems to rely on a very few devices to indicate grounding, there were in fact more devices available in the older state of the language. The predecessor of Russian, Old East Slavic, has a grammatical

[13]The exceptions to this statement that Tomlin found included instances where a less significant event occurs in a dependent clause linked to a highly significant event in an independent clause — thus preserving the hierarchy of more significant=independent clause: less significant =dependent clause.

tool which is the direct forerunner of the деепричастие: the short active participle. Corresponding to this form is another participle, the long active participle. (The long or pronominal form contrasts with the short or nominal form — the latter consists of the former with a suffixed pronoun, e.g. несыи = несы (present active short participle) 'carrying' + и (=jь) 'he'.) An aspectual system was in operation, although a small minority of verbs could be used in either aspect, with the context and choice of tenses helping to clarify the meaning. There were a number of options which are unavailable in the modern language. Among the preterite tenses were the Perfect, ancestor of the modern simple preterite, the Pluperfect, the Imperfect, and the Aorist. There were competing preterite forms of the verb быти 'to be', which are distinguished by some experts as belonging to different aspects. A frequently used construction was the Dative Absolute, a unique use of the active participle plus subject, both expressed in the Dative case. Of all of the above mentioned categories, most have disappeared from the modern language, or have reduced in frequency. The Dative Absolute disappeared, and the frequency of long active participles has dropped. The short active participles have lost both their declension and their agreement with the subject and have become the деепричастия. The modern present active participle is a restoration via Church Slavic of the old long form. The Perfect has lost its auxiliary and broadened its meaning to become the all purpose past tense, the Imperfect and Aorist having disappeared. The Pluperfect has degenerated into a construction using an unchanging particle to express aborted past action. Быти is now an imperfective verb, whose competing preterites died with the Imperfect and Aorist.

There are almost certainly other tools of foregrounding and backgrounding in Old East Slavic and Modern Russian perhaps involving syntactic categories such as word order, main vs. subordinate clauses, semantic categories of individual verbs, etc. Within this study only the use of tense, aspect, and participial constructions in a specific Old East Slavic document is examined. It is my feeling that these are the principal grounding tools of the language. The question which motivates this study, however, is: "How does Old East Slavic, in this one specific text, use these grammatical tools, more numerous than in the modern language, for encoding foregrounding and backgrounding?" The text chosen for this investigation is the Galician-Volynian Chronicle, a thirteenth century Southwestern chronicle text. The nature of this text, being a record of events encompassing about sixty years of history, is such that the author does not consistently develop a single narrative, but rather relates various narratives, combining them with shorter passages of related material. A better source text for an investigation of the peak level would be a narrative text devoted to one episode, or, better yet, several such narratives for comparison.

The method used in this study to identify discourse levels of individual propositions is introspection, fraught with its potentially incumbent pitfalls. Unfortunately, the experimental method employed by linguists such as Tomlin (1985) cannot be used to investigate a dead language. There are other possibilities for a more empirical method. One such method would be to determine the level of co-occurrence of the constellation of features which are said to accompany foreground clauses: telic events, repetition of the same subject, human topics, etc. A problem with this method is that some of the features are circular: for example, foreground clauses are said to present

chronologically sequenced events. Yet our understanding of the event as sequenced may depend on our understanding of the form as a foreground form, or vice versa. Tomlin had a group of subjects identify the discourse levels of events presented in a videotape, not as a written narrative. A possible method in the case of this text would perhaps be to ask someone (or more than one person) trained to read Old East Slavic, but unaware of any hypothesis as to the co-occurrence of discourse levels with certain forms, to read the text and identify the discourse level of each proposition.

Summary

The discourse levels of foregrounding and backgrounding have been simply defined in terms of the significance an event has for the plot. Foregrounded events are significant and form the basic story line. Backgrounded events are less significant and may enrich our understanding of the story line without actually advancing the plot. The various properties of the events on these levels have been briefly discussed: for example, foregrounded events are sequenced and tend to be expressed by punctual verbs, with the focus on the predicate. Stative verbs and unmarked focus, on the other hand, are typical of the backgrounding level. The distinction of foregrounding and backgrounding may be realized by a wide variety of morphological and syntactic devices, tense and aspect being among the most common. The actual division into more than two levels of of grounding varies among languages: five, four, or three in the languages surveyed by Jones and Jones, while Tomlin (1985) posits three for English. We may, however, speak broadly of two levels: foreground and background. This study is an attempt to survey the use of specific grammatical tools (in a specific document, discussed in the next chapter) in the realization of this

broad distinction and cannot, therefore, be regarded as a complete study of grounding in Old East Slavic. The tools of grounding in Modern Russian contrasted with the wide availability of potential tools in Old East Slavic suggest the central question of this study: "How do all the various tense/aspect combinations of verbal forms and participial forms operate in the grounding system of Old East Slavic?"

CHAPTER TWO

THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE

Introduction

Examining the foregrounding and backgrounding system of Old East Slavic requires a sufficiently long document by a single author. In order to gain the greatest insight into the widest variety of devices encoding grammatical distinctions it should be from a time period in which the greatest number of grammatical tools were operating. The text should be sufficiently close to the popular language, but narrative in nature with the prevailing tense being past, in order to examine a plot line and its associated actions. Finally, the language of the text should reflect as much as possible the norms of the East Slavic literary language, which is difficult when one considers how extensively and for how long the South Slavic-based Church Slavic language was used beside Common East Slavic in literary works. This chapter will show how the Galician part of the *Galician-Volynian Chronicle* best fits these needs. It was written in the thirteenth century, the best period in which to cover both old and new grammatical tools. It is a fifty-

seven page narrative text by a single author. Its language, although phonologically largely Middle Ukrainian, is morphologically and syntactically largely Common East Slavic, with a strong component of Church Slavic features.

Genre and Age

The choice of literary genre or type of document was motivated by a desire to find a type of narrative text which best illustrates the use of preterite tenses and other verbal forms in the foregrounding and backgrounding system of Old East Slavic at a time when the maximum number of grammatical tools were in use. The thirteenth century was chosen because this is the time when the invariant participle appears.[1] (That is, the short active participle used without case/gender/number agreement with the subject — the predecessor of the modern verbal adverb, or деепричастие.) In addition, at this period, the Aorist, according to N.G. Samsonov, is last used in its earlier meaning of a past event as a moment in time,[2] the new form of the Pluperfect appears[3] (the "double Perfect", although it turns out to be attested only in the Volynian half of the chronicle, not surveyed here), the Perfect is common both with and without its auxiliary verb, and the majority of verbs participate fully in the aspectual system (that is, are used consistently as either imperfective or perfective). The Pluperfect has not yet degenerated into the modern было construction of interrupted action,[4] the elliptic Perfect (the Perfect without the auxiliary verb) is not yet

---

[1]N.G. Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973), p.229.
[2]Ibid., p.122.
[3]V.V. Ivanov, "Istorija vremennyx form glagola," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Nauka, 1982), p.109.
[4]Ibid., p.127.

the predominant past tense, and the Imperfect, though not present in the popular language, is still widespread in literature.[5] Thus this is the period which shows the greatest use of both the Imperfect/Aorist contrast, the elliptic and full Perfect, the invariant participle, and the aspectual system, permitting the greatest amount of comparison of the use of the different tools for grounding.

Religious documents were excluded from consideration because of their extreme linguistic conservatism, high style, and because many of them were translated from other languages. In translated literature and "bookish" documents, the Aorist and the full Perfect were preserved much later than in some other types, and so were rejected as being representative of a highly-elevated style. The various tales, historical narratives, hagiographies, and oratorical works can also be highly stylized, and were rejected for that reason (although the Galician-Volynian Chronicle is also said to be highly stylized). While closer to the vernacular, legal documents such as the грамоты and the Русская правда show few opportunities for preterites other than the Perfect (which we would expect to be the case in a document in which the prevailing tense is the Present). In such documents, not only is the Aorist uncommon, the Imperfect and Dative Absolute are absent altogether.[6] Finally, the source text was chosen because its length, fifty-seven pages by a single author,[7] provides a substantial corpus of forms for analysis.

---

[5]A.A. Dibrov and V.S. Ovčinnikova, Očerki drevnerusskogo jazyka (Rostov-na-Donu: Rostovskij universitet, 1965), p.91.

[6]Ibid., p.91, and A.M. Sabenina,"Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), p.417.

[7]George A. Perfecky,"Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle," The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, XII:1-2 (1969-1972), convincingly argues for two authors and two redactions: the Galician, with events from 1201 to

An argument may be made that the language of the Galician-Volynian Chronicle is artificial. Evidence has been presented, for example that suggests that the Imperfect tense was absent from the spoken language. In the first place, this evidence consists of legal and commercial documents, where the prevailing tense is Present and there are ample opportunities to use the Perfect, but not the ordinary preterite tenses. Secondly, even if the language of the chronicle is only a literary language, I would argue that it is as suitable a topic for investigation as, for example, the Simple Past tense in French, used only in written text. Finally, there are many constructions and forms in many languages which are rare outside written language (such as the Russian деепричастие), but this cannot be construed to imply that when found, these forms are inconsistently used because native speakers have over time lost their understanding of them.

Manuscripts

The Hypatian Codex, which was found at the Monastery of St. Hypatius at Kostroma, contains, besides the Primary and Kievan chronicles, a copy of the thirteenth century original of the Galician-Volynian Chronicle (henceforth, the GVC). The Hypatian Codex dates from c.1425.[8] It is currently at the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad. The Xlebnikovskij text is also a copy of the original, textually better than the Hypatian, originating in Southwestern Russia in the sixteenth century.[9] The

---

1260, and the Volynian, with events from 1261 to 1292. He bases his argument on the contrast of styles, and on the available counter-arguments against other proposed divisions. See also Dean S. Worth's excellent "distributional styllistic" study: "Linguistics and historiography: a problem of dating in the Galician-Volhynian-Chronicle," Indiana Slavic Studies, III (1963), pp. 173-185.

[8]Valentin Kiparsky, Russian Historical Grammar: Vol. 1: The Development of the Sound System (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979), p.73.

[9]Information presented about the different manuscripts is from Perfecky,"Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle," pp. 62-63.

Podgodinskij manuscript was copied from the Xlebnikovskij in the seventeenth century, when the Xlebnikovskij was in better shape. The Cracow text is an eighteenth-century distorted version of the Podgodinskij, in Latin script. Finally, the Ermolaevskij copy is an eighteenth or late seventeenth-century abbreviated and distorted version of the Xlebnikovskij, copied from an an unknown source. In this study we will be concerned only with the Hypatian, Xlebnikovskij, and Podgodinskij versions, the latter two being virtually the same. The chronicle itself describes, in the Galician part, events in Galicia from 1201 to 1260. (The Volynian part describes events in Volynia from 1261 to 1292.)

Language

George Y. Shevelov describes the Hypatian manuscript, which includes the GVC, as varying linguistically between a local recension of Church Slavic and colloquial Old Ukrainian, with stylistic motivation for the variation within the text.[10] A.I. Hens'ors'kyj describes the language as displaying the lexical and syntactic phenomena which prevailed in the Old Russian literary language in Galicia and Volynia in the second half of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth.[11] He asserts that the later copyists modified sometimes the phonetics, sometimes flexions, but left the lexicon and the syntax wholly untouched.[12] The GVC has been analyzed in the present study on this basis: although the oldest available manuscript dates from the fifteenth century, it is largely reflective of thirteenth

---

[10]George Y. Shevelov, A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979), p.221.
[11]A.I. Hens'ors'kyj, Značennja form mynuloho času v Halyc'ko-Volyns'komu Litopysu (Kiev: Akademiïja nauk ukraïns'koï R.S.R., 1957), p.3.
[12]Ibid., p.4.

century norms. George A. Perfecky, who wrote the first English translation of the GVC, conducted a linguistic analysis of the language of the chronicle, and found it to be Middle Ukrainian. Before continuing, I will summarize his findings.[13] He identifies all the major, and some minor, linguistic features of the evolving language, in the categories of phonology, morphology, and syntax.

Phonologically, Perfecky finds that the work is highly native, i.e. Middle Ukrainian.[14] The evidence of Ukrainian is found in: the confusion of y with i; the merger of с and из to become з; Middle Ukrainian new ě; o → [o:] (written oo, although [o:] → u, present in Galician-Volynian manuscripts since the 12th/13th centuries, is not attested); tense ъ → y, which could also be Church Slavic; tense ь is either deleted, leaving behind regressive palatalization (Common East Slavic) or is replaced by i (Church Slavic); confusion of old ě/i (while there is some confusion of ě/e, the latter is a Russian feature, although in unstressed position it can also be a North Ukrainian feature[15]). The text also shows the following features, suggesting Common East Slavic: the loss of weak jers and vocalization of strong ones (although some jers are retained, suggesting Church Slavic), spellings ki, gi, xi, (Church Slavic ky, gy, xy are also found), and confusion of c with č (this being typical of Russian Novgorod-Pskov dialect). Finally, the occurrence of non-iotized vowels after other vowels is indicative of Church Slavic. The Volynian half of the chronicle has additional Middle Ukrainian features.

---

[13]Perfecky,"Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle", pp. 88-112.

[14]Note that Shevelov, A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language, lists the Hypatian manuscript as a source for Old Ukrainian, (p.221), which he identifies as dating from the 11th century to 1387, (p.203), rather than for Early Middle Ukrainian, which he dates from 1387 to 1575, (p.388).

[15]Dr. T.R. Carlton, personal communication: this point was not mentioned by Perfecky.

Morphologically, the chronicle is shown by Perfecky to have more Common East Slavic features. There are various declensional stem confusions, including a typically Middle Ukrainian confusion of Genitive, Locative, and Accusative, resulting in confusion of the prepositions у and в, as well as widespread use of u-stem endings for masculine o-stem nouns. The other Middle Ukrainian features are: the use of the pronoun тъй for тътъ, the predominance of infinitives in -ti, (which could of course also be Church Slavic), and the preservation of the Vocative case (although the Vocative is still used in Russian texts up to the sixteenth century). Common East Slavic features include various other stem confusions, the confusion of Genitive fem. sg./Nominative-Accusative fem. pl./Accusative masc. pl. in soft nouns, long adjectives, pronouns and participles (either Church Slāvic front nasal, its East Slavic reflex ja, or Common East Slavic ě), the broad use of the Accusative animate category, the occurrence of язъ, тобь, and собь, and the use of soft -ть on 3sg/3pl verbs. Both Common East Slavic and Church Slavic adjective endings are used, the contracted Imperfect forms predominate (while the Church Slavic uncontracted forms also appear occasionally), the Conditional with the Aorist of быти is found (suggesting both East Slavic and Church Slavic), also the Pluperfect with contracted Imperfect auxiliary, (together with the uncontracted Imperfect and бь-form auxiliaries, which are Church Slavic). Two genuinely Russian features are the occurrences of infinitives in -ть and verbs in -iva-. There are a few Church Slavic features as well: 2sg Presents in -ši, instances of the 2pl Imperative in -ěte (Nikol'skij suspected this could instead be a reflection of a

local feature[16]) "imperfective Aorists" of быти (бь-forms), and the athematic 1pl ending used was -мы, sometimes -мъ (the former is Church Slavic, the latter both Church Slavic and Common East Slavic — the Middle Ukrainian -мо not being attested).

Syntactically, the work is mainly Church Slavic with some Common East Slavic features. The only Middle Ukrainian feature is the use of до in the meaning of в or к. The absence of indirect speech is a feature typical of Common East Slavic, as are: the use of the invariant participle, the absence of prepositions (reflecting an older stage of Common East Slavic), the Dative of possession, the replacement of the supine by the infinitive, and the use of subordinate clauses with аже, ать, оже, and бо (this last also Church Slavic). The Church Slavic syntactic features are: the preponderance of hypotactic constructions; the use of the the Dative Absolute (mostly temporal subordinated, some main clauses); the use of subordinate clauses with аще, да, иже, and яко; the use of the short past active participle as an infinitive, the construction бь + past active participle to express a predicative attribute; the substantivized use of the long participles; and the attributively-used construction кто + present active participle.

It is clear from Perfecky's analysis that, morphologically and syntactically, the source text is a reasonable example of thirteenth century East Slavic chronicle narrative. Its designation as "the first document representative of the beginnings of MU [Middle Ukrainian]"[17] is based primarily on phonological features. In fact, Perfecky also concludes that:

---

[16]A. Nikol'skij, "O jazyke Ipatskoj letopisi," Russkij filologičeskij vestnik, 41, (nos. 1-2),(Warsaw,1899), p.256.
[17]Perfecky,"Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle," p.112.

> The language of the GVC is a learned language basically Ch S (better preserved in the chronicle's Galician than in its Volynian section) into which elements of not only that ES vernacular, which was common to both the North and the South of the Eastern Slavic territory, but also specifically local features have crept in [sic].[18]

Perfecky shows that the Galician half is closer to Church Slavic, and while both halves show Middle Ukrainian features, there are more of them in the Volynian. The Volynian section is closer to Common East Slavic than Church Slavic. Based on the evidence presented, and the knowledge that Church Slavic played an enormous role in East Slavic literature, we may conclude that the Galician section, which provides the corpus of forms for the present study, is a legitimate representative of the literary language of thirteenth century Rus'.

The Corpus of Examples

Citations from the chronicle are from the version published in the series Pamjatniki literatury drevnej Rusi. This version was typeset (without symbols for nasal vowels or variants of i, and with ѝ introduced) by O.P. Lixačeva, who also provides a parallel modern Russian translation. Occasionally I have corrected her version by referring to the edition published in 1908 and reprinted in 1962, in the Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej. In the latter the reader is provided with alternative forms from the Xlebnikovskij and Podgodinskij texts, to which I also refer. All deviations from the Lixačeva version are noted by footnote. References for the chronicle itself are indicated in parentheses following the quotation. References for all other quotations, including the passages of Old Russian text quoted by C.H. van Schooneveld in the chapter on the Perfect, are given in the footnotes. The

---

[18]Perfecky,"Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle," p.111.

translation which follows each passage quoted from the chronicle is based mainly on Perfecky's English translation, also on Lixačeva's Russian translation and examination of the original itself. Occasionally I have modified Perfecky's free translations to render a translation closer to the original text, particularly in the case of the verbal forms.

For purposes of identification, the verbal or participial forms being examined have been underlined in each quotation from the GVC, as well as in the translation that follows. Other forms which are being examined for contrast with the category which is the topic of that chapter have been double underlined. For example, where the Aorist is contrasted with the Perfect in Chapter Seven (on the Perfect), the Aorists are double underlined, the Perfects are single underlined. In the case of the Dative Absolutes, the entire construction, participle plus Dative subject, has been underlined, as well as the corresonding parts of the translation.

I have collected and examined occurrences of the Aorist, the active participles, including the Dative absolutes, and the simple preterites of быти from the first twenty pages (in the Pamjatniki edition), which provide an ample corpus of these forms. For the Imperfect, the Perfect, and the Pluperfect, however, I have resorted to the full fifty-seven pages of the Galician portion of the chronicle, in order to have enough forms to make a reasonable scholarly analysis.

Summary

An analysis of the foregrounding and backgrounding functions of the grammatical tools of Old East Slavic has not yet been published. The Galician portion of the Galician-Volynian chronicle is well-suited for such a

study. It is a narrative text and thus contains a variety of preterite forms. It was written at a time in the development of the language when the maximum number of grammatical tools were present and operating, available for use in encoding grounding. This allows us to draw conclusions about a wide variety of forms. It is long enough to provide a large corpus of such forms (and some of them occur infrequently), a corpus written, as the best available evidence shows us, by a single author. The language reflects the prevailing literary language of Rus' at that time. Therefore it provides a good beginning for the investigation of grounding in Old East Slavic, which should then be expanded to cover other documents of different types and from other periods, and especially other tools of grounding.

CHAPTER THREE

THE AORIST

Introduction

Of the wide variety of available grammatical tools of foregrounding and backgrounding to be surveyed, the most frequently found is the Aorist . It is the most basic of the preterite tenses. In this chapter its role in the grounding system is investigated, and it is found that the Aorist is a foregrounding tool, indeed, the main foregrounding tool. The use of the Aorist signals an event which causes a change of state, an event which is a part of the chain of the principal events of a plot line.

Form and Frequency

The forms of the Aorist which occur in the twenty page source text show no remarkable characteristics. The only differences between the East Slavic and Old Church Slavonic forms are purely phonological. The use of an

identical ending -ста for both 2 du. and 3 du. is already attested as a possible variant for OCS.[1]

Of all the forms examined in the present study (Aorist, Imperfect, Pluperfect, Perfect tenses, all varieties of active participles including Dative Absolutes), fully fifty percent of those on the first twenty pages of the source text are Aorists. (I include here the Aorists of быти but not the "imperfective" Aorists, or бъ-forms.) As the Aorists of быти are discussed in Chapter Five, I will limit myself here to discussing the remaining 534 Aorists.

Meaning

There are two currents of thought regarding the meaning of the Aorist. A.A. Potebnja emphasized the "моментальность" expressed by the Aorist, that is, that the Aorist expressed a past action as a moment in time, without reference to its completeness or being finished.[2] E.N. Prokopovič concurs, suggesting that the actual length of time of an action is irrelevent to the meaning expressed by the Aorist.[3] N.G. Samsonov's view is close to this. As far as the period prior to the thirteenth century is concerned, he sees the Aorist as expressing an action which "совершилось в прошлом как один целостный акт, без повторений и перерывов, как целиком законченное в прошлом действие."[4]

---

[1]William R. Schmalstieg, An Introduction to Old Church Slavic (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1983), pp.106-107.
[2]A.A. Potebnja, Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike. Vol. IV. Part II: Glagol (Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1977), pp.185, 193.
[3]E. N. Prokopovič, "Glagol'noe skazuemoe," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), p.43.
[4]N.G. Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973), p.122.

Against this picture of the Aorist expressing an event as one moment is the view that the Aorist expresses an "ordinary past" action. Thus C.H. van Schooneveld, who characterizes the Aorist as the unmarked preterite tense,[5] emphasizes only the following two characteristics: the Aorist a) indicates that the action took place in the past, and b) suggests vividness of the happening in the speaker's mind.[6] Similarly, Samsonov describes the meaning of the Aorist beginning in the thirteenth century as "обозначения прошедшего действия без отношения к его законченности или длительности, просто для обозначения самого процесса, совершившегося в прошлом."[7] The change in the meaning of the Aorist from the early period to the period beginning in the thirteenth century, while not explained, is presumably linked to the spread of the Perfect and the rise of the aspectual opposition.

The idea that the Aorist expresses a sequence of events in the past is specifically refuted by van Schooneveld, this meaning requiring instead the right contextual assistance.[8] Yet in one place he writes: "The speaker uses the aorist for the action which he considers basic in his narration."[9] Furthermore, he contrasts the Aorist and Imperfect by explaining that the Aorist allows the effects of the process it denotes to continue into the situation immediately following, while the Imperfect does not, i.e. presents a self-contained process.[10] I contend that it is exactly this ability to denote an continuing effect which makes the Aorist the primary vehicle for expressing

---

[5]C.H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('s-Gravenhague: Mouton, 1959), p.165.
[6]Ibid., pp.32-33.
[7]Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk, p.122.
[8]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System , p.27.
[9]Ibid., p.33.
[10]Ibid., p.58.

succession of actions. What van Schooneveld calls "allowing the effects to continue" I would call "effecting a change of state."

I would argue that the "totality" and the completedness of an action are more likely to be expressed by the perfective aspect. This becomes clearer when we examine the instances of imperfective Aorists in the source text. Although the actions presented by Aorists do not always take up simply a moment in time, for the purpose of communicating a sequence of plot-advancing events, they are presented as such. As far as the foregrounding and backgrounding system of the language is concerned, I have found the Aorist to be the principal means of expressing foregrounded events, as far as this particular source text is concerned.

In the following passage, the ability of the Aorist to present the main plot line events is demonstrated:

> Святослава же яша и ведоша и в Ляхы. Олександръ же сѣде в Володимерь. Тогда же яша Володимера Пиньскаго. Бѣ бо Инъгваръ с ляхы и Мьстиславъ. Потом же сѣде Инъгваръ в Володимерь. Поя у него Лестько дщерь и пусти, иде же ко Орельску. (240)
>
> They captured Svjatoslav and led him away to Poland. Oleksander began to reign in Volodimer. At that time they captured Volodimer of Pinsk. Ingvar and Mstislav were with the Poles. Later Ingvar began to reign in Volodimer. Lestko took Ingvar's daughter to wed, but let her go and went himself to Orel'sk.

The Aorist events clearly indicate a moving forward on the plot line, even if there is more than one; the sole Imperfect verb (бѣ; see Chapter Five on the preterites of быти for its use as an Imperfect) does not advance the plot: captured Svjatoslav→led him away (Ingvar and Mstislav are with the Poles at this time)→Ingvar begins reign in Volodimer→Lestko takes Ingvar's

daughter→releases her→goes to Orel'sk. The capture of Volodimer at Pinsk is a simultaneous event on a separate, but nonetheless significant, plot line.

Aspect and Grounding

The Aorist is usually formed from perfective verbs, or verbs which do not adhere consistently to one or the other aspect. There are thirty-three instances, about six percent of the total, of imperfective Aorists in the twenty page source text. That foregrounding should coincide with the perfective aspect should not surprise us. A plot is more likely to be advanced by goal oriented actions which can be seen in their totality (perfective) than by actions which are repeated over a period of time, of a long duration, or which are not goal oriented (imperfective).

Where imperfective Aorists do occur, there are various reasons which can explain the uncommon combination. Occasionally, a negated imperfective Aorist expresses an action which does not occur at a point in the plot: a change of state would have occurred were the action followed through — we must nonetheless accept that a continuation of state where a change of state may have been anticipated can be a highly significant non-event in the narrative. For example: "И за то не смѣша галичанѣ ничтоже створити, бѣ бо иньхъ много угоръ." (238) 'Because of this, the Galicians did not dare try anything, for there were many other Hungarians [at the time of Rurik's assault on Halyč.]' Aside from не смѣти, не мощи is commonly found in this meaning.

As a sub-type of this category we find instances where an action was attempted but failed, though closely associated with a juncture, that is, a point at which a change of state occurs, and expressed using не мощи:

Половцемь же ставшимъ, Юрьгий Кончакович бъ болийше всихъ половець, не може стати противу лицю их, бѣгающи же ему, и мнози избьени быша до рѣкы Днепра. (256)

When the Polovtsy rose to fight them, Jurij Končakovič [who] was the strongest of all the Polovtsy, could not withstand them and fled, and many were slaughtered as far as the river Dnieper.

Although one goal is not realized, there are nonetheless consequences to the failure, which creates a change of state.

Sometimes an imperfective Aorist expresses durative actions which are not goal oriented, but nonetheless carry too great a significance for the plot to be expressed by a backgrounding form. (Cf. the modern "general-factual" use of the imperfective.) In this category fall many verbs which, although imperfective, appear in the source text predominantly as past active participles and Aorists: гнати 'to pursue', воевати 'to wage war', хотѣти 'to want', бити ся 'to fight', etc. In the following passage, the military engagement expressed by бися is the central event upon which the other events depend, yet semantically it is inconclusive, the conclusion being expressed by побѣди: "Роман же ѣха во Угры и бися с братомъ и побѣди въза Галичь, а Володимеръ бѣжа во Путивль." (240) 'Roman went to Hungary, fought with his brother, defeated him, and took Halyč, while Volodimer fled to Putivl'.' Similarly, in "Ляхи же многи избиша и гнаша по нихъ до рѣкы Вепря." (250) 'They slaughtered many Poles and pursued them as far as the Vepr.', the act of pursuing, while not leading to one goal (catching up) leads to another goal (the pursued left the region). Thus a non-goal oriented lexical item (гнати) is combined with a foregrounding tense (the Aorist).

Another group of verbs which, though imperfective, appear frequently as Aorists, are what should be considered inceptive-duratives: for example владѣти and княжити. Thus we find: "Потом же Данило и Василко Лестьковою помощью прияста Тихомль и Перемиль от Олександра и княжаста с матерью в немь." (248) 'Then Danilo and Vasilko, with Lestko's help, took Tixoml' and Peremil' from Oleksander and [began to] reign there with their mother.' The verb идти, which is used both imperfectively and perfectively in the source text, can be included in this category when it is used perfectively, in the sense of modern пойти 'to go, to set off' (cf. the example from page 240 cited above under Meaning).

Actions which are repeated, perhaps performed by many persons, or upon many persons, but associated with a juncture, that is, a point at which a change of state occurs, can be expressed by imperfective Aorists. Thus:

> И посла по нихъ Данилъ Гаврила Душиловича и Семена Олуевича, Василка Гавриловича, и биша и до Сухое Дорогве, и колодники изымаша, и возвратишася в Володимерь с великою славою. (250)
>
> Danilo sent Gavril Dušilovič, Semen Oluevič, and Vasilko Gavrilovič after them, and they fought as far as the Suxaja Dorogva, released their prisoners, and returned to Volodimer with great honour.

The common element in all the instances of the Aorist in the source text is its association with the junctures that make up the outline of the plot. It should not surprise then, that it is the most common grammatical form. We must accept that its ability to express a chain of events is a result of its meaning of a past action presented as a moment, that is, seen for its imprint on the plot rather than for other aspects. These aspects include the action's

influence on simultaneous events, its duration in time, its repetitiveness or ability to characterize an actor, all of which are suggested by other grammatical forms. The Aorist suggests none of these and presents the action as a moment in time precisely because its effect on the plot depends solely on its taking place at all, not on other events happening at the same time or on its being repeated or it occurring over a period of time.

Conclusions

The Aorist has been found to be the principal tool of foregrounding in the source text. As it conveys the basics of the plot it should then not surprise us that it is by far the most frequently met of the grammatical forms surveyed. It expresses an action which took place in the past, and furthermore presents that action as a moment in time, in order to communicate its significance for the plot: it accomplishes a change of state. It would appear that the Aorist here functions in the way suggested by Potebnja and Prokopovič: presentation of an action as a moment — it is this "summarizing" of an action (without reference to its completion) that enables the Aorist to effectively encode foregrounding. If it were to present simply the "ordinary past" it would be difficult to establish that it was the foregrounding marker: the latter is more likely to be the case in a text written after the Imperfect had disappeared and the simple preterite (the former elliptic Perfect) is more frequently used, and with a greater role for aspect. The modern foregrounding tool, the perfective aspect, is preferred for the Aorist in our text except where: a negated action denies a change of state yet this is highly significant for the plot, a durative action fails in its explicit goal but succeeds in another, implicit goal, duratives are used to express inceptive meaning, and repeated actions are summed up and associated with one

juncture. In the next chapter, we will see that similar exceptions are made to the rule that the Imperfect associates with the imperfective aspect. Thus, although we already observe the operation of the system of aspectual pairing — the system Hopper and other linguists credit with a grounding function — at this time, in this document, the coding of the Aorist overides aspect in marking foreground events.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE IMPERFECT

Introduction

The other preterite simplex tense, the Imperfect, does not occur with nearly as much frequency as the Aorist. It contrasts with the Aorist in other ways as well: it occurs almost exclusively with imperfective verbs, and, as will be shown in this chapter, it is a vehicle for backgrounding rather than foregrounding. While its role in the grounding system makes it similar to the participles and perfect tenses, discussed in Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight, it adds its own unique contribution on levels other than foregrounding, for example in the expression of habitual or repeated action.

Form and Frequency

Identification of the Imperfect presents a problem for certain members of particular morphological classes. Firstly, the Old Church Slavonic full forms of the Imperfect endings (-ьа-, -аа-) are by the time this chronicle was written replaced by the contracted forms (-я-, -а-). For perfective/

imperfective pairs of verbs ending in -ити/-яти, however, the contracted forms result for both aspects in identical Imperfect forms. This means that the aspectual membership of some Imperfects will be impossible to determine. (Cf. P.S. Kuznecov who cites an example from the Laurentian Codex: поставляху — Imperfect either from perfective поставити or imperfective поставляти.[1]) For the purposes of this study, any such cases are assumed to be imperfective: I am assuming that a full paradigm of a verb in -яти developed initially on the base of the occurrence of the contracted Imperfect of an -ити verb. This is in fact the explanation offered by V.V. Borodič.[2] For example, the definite (later, perfective) verb кръстити forms 3sg Imperfect кръштааше, whence the present tense forms and complete paradigm of the indefinite (later, imperfective) verb кръщати. Borodič argues this type of origin for large numbers of verbs, especially ити/яти pairs. Secondly, verbs with a suffix -а- in the infinitive and Aorist will have contracted Imperfect forms (in all persons other than 2/3sg and 3pl, where the endings are distinct from the Aorist) identical with the Aorist. (For example, 1sg Aorist of знати 'to know' would be знахъ; the uncontracted Imperfect would be знаахъ, giving us a contracted Imperfect знахъ.) Fortunately, most of the forms in the source text are 3sg/pl, where the endings are distinct anyway. A.P. Vlasto mentions this problem,[3] and it is noted where it occurs in the examples cited in this study.

---

[1]P.S. Kuznecov, Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Akademija nauk, 1959), p.198.

[2]V.V. Borodič, "K voprosu o formirovanii soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida v slavjanskix jazykax," Voprosy jazykoznanija, No. 6, (1953), pp. 78-79.

[3]A.P. Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), p.158, where he also suggests this confusion as contributing to the decline of these tenses.

There are 196 examples of the Imperfect in the source text, 73 of these in the first twenty pages. This is a frequency about twelve percent of that of the Aorist, less than that of the present active participle, the form it is most similar to in meaning, although the Imperfect is just as frequent as the non-Dative present active participles.

Meaning

The Imperfect expresses actions which are usually simultaneous to the main plot line events. They are often repeated or durative actions. Sometimes they express habitual action. They can be used on the deeper level of backgrounding, expressing information about a character through events without a link to the main plot line. For example, in the following passage:

> Бь бо лукавый льстьць нареченъ, и всихъ стропотливее, и ложь пламянъ, всеименитый отцемь добрымъ. Убожьство возбраняще злобу его, лъжею питашеся языкъ его, но мудростию возложаше вьру на лжюу, красящеся лестью паче вьнца, лжеименьць, зане прелщаше не токмо чюжихъ, но и своихъ возлюбленых, имения ради ложь. Того бо дьля жалаше быти у Изяслава. (262)
>
> He was said to be a cunning liar, the most cunning of all, an ardent liar, famous because of his good father. Poverty deterred his wickedness, but his tongue fed on lies, with guile he made a lie seem trustworthy, he delighted in a lie more than a crown, a hypocrite, because he cheated not only strangers, but his loved ones, deceit for the sake of profit. Because of this he wanted to be with Izjaslav.

one of the characters is described through his habitual actions, repeated over a lifetime, and relevant to the plot only in that by knowing his personality we may better understand his motives. The events described

are not connected to the plot line events temporally (e.g., are not simultaneous with them) or spatially (not necessarily occurring at the same place). This is what distinguishes them from the level of background events.

The Imperfect expresses background events as well, on a level of grounding somewhat closer to foregrounding because of its close association with the plot line. Thus: "Изииде же с нимъ единъ Судиславъ, на ньм же метаху камение, рекуще: Изинди[4] из града, мятежниче земли!'" (274) 'The only one who left with them was Sudislav, and they threw (were throwing) stones at him, saying, "Leave the city, you instigator of rebellion in the land!"' On the same level of background events, it can express a temporally related situation: "Филя же строяшеся на брань, мняше же бо, яко никто может стати противу ему на брань." (254) 'Filja was preparing for battle, thinking that no-one could oppose him in battle.' Here a temporally related situation serves to explain an action. These last two examples show actions/states expressed by the Imperfect which are temporally and spatially connected to the plot line events.

Very often the Imperfect gives a motivation for, or an explanation of, a foregrounded action, as in the following passage:

> Тевтивилу же исповѣдь пискупъ и пребощь Вирьжань, сожалишаси по немь, вѣдяху бо, аще Тевътивилъ не бы изгнанъ, Литовьская земля в руку бь ихъ, и крещение неволею прияли быша. (322)
>
> The bishop warned Tevtivil, and the provost Viržan and he took pity on him, for they knew, that if Tevtivil had not been driven out, Lithuania would have been in their hands and would have had to accept Christianity against her will.

[4]The Pamjatniki edition has "изииде," a misprint.

where knowledge motivates kindness. The majority of such uses of the Imperfect are, interestingly, attested only by the Hypatian version: the other two manuscripts have present active participles instead.

Aspect

The overwhelming majority of Imperfects are imperfective in aspect. There are only a handful of instances of perfective Imperfects (3.5% of the total) and they are very close to the meanings of the imperfective Aorists cited in the preceding chapter. In the following example, an action is repeated, yet associated with a single point in the plot, that is, not repeated over a period of time. Here there is no strong sense of juncture, and unlike the cases of repeated actions expressed by imperfective Aorists, here there is a stronger emphasis on the repetitiveness rather than the result:

> Бѣ бо городъ обишла вода, и сильная лозина, и вербье, и не свѣдущимся самѣмь, идеже кто биаше. Егда же си отступяху от боя, они же належахуть на оны, а коли они отступяху, а они належаху на си. За невидьние не приятъ бысть градъ томь дни. (270)
>
> The city was surrounded by water, dense vines, and willows, and thus they didn't know who was fighting where. When these troops would withdraw, the others would engage them, and when the others would withdraw, they would engage these. Thus, because they couldn't see each other, the city was not taken that day.

There is one singular case of what could be an innovative use of the perfective Imperfect to express an "inceptive in progress": "И бѣ Батый у города и отроци его обсѣдяху градъ." (294) 'Batyj was outside the city, while his men were laying siege to it.', in the sense of "were in the process of beginning a siege," as opposed to "were besieging."

As with the imperfective Aorist, absence of action associated with a juncture is possible, perhaps with the additional meaning of repeated non-action:

> Потом же Мьстиславъ, великый удатный князь, умре. Жадящю бо ему видити сына своего Данила. Гльбъ же Зеремьевичь, убьженъ бысть завистью, не пустяще[5] его. (268)
>
> Then the great and successful Prince Mstislav died. He wanted very much to see his son Danilo, but Gleb Zeremeevič, inflamed by envy, would not let him.

Grounding

As shown from the above examples, the Imperfect functions on the two levels of grounding that the Aorist does not: the level of background events or situations, and the level of deep background information. These two levels are distinguished mainly by the relevance of the information for the plot line: the latter level is used to provide more information about a character than can be gleaned from the plot and associated events. (The former level consists of states and events that are temporally and spatially connected to the plot line.) The additional meanings that the Imperfect carries which distinguish it from other forms on these two levels of grounding are the meanings of repeated or habitual action. It will be seen that the Imperfect can be distinguished from the Present Active Participle in that the latter is used to supplement other forms, both foregrounding and backgrounding, including Imperfects. Because the PRAP is more restricted in its occurrence, where two background events occur, both simultaneous

---

[5]Note that the Pamjatniki edition has „пустяще", whereas the Polnoe sobranie has „пустяше."

with a foreground event and with each other, we may assume that the more important one is expressed by the Imperfect, the less important, by the participle. The choice is a subjective assessment by the author.

Conclusions

The instances of the Imperfect in the source text express habitual, repeated, or durative actions which are secondary in prominence to the foregrounded Aorists. As expected, the Imperfect is not as frequently found as the foregrounding tense, the Aorist. It expresses background events or situations related to the plot line, or deeper background information about a character. It can explain or motivate another, usually foregrounded action, and is normally imperfective, but perfective Imperfects can occur where repeated action is strongly associated with a single point in the plot. As in the previous chapter, we see that the the perfective/imperfective pairing is subordinated by the tense system in encoding grounding, since the Imperfect always predominates over the imperfective aspect as the backgrounding form.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SIMPLE PRETERITES OF БЫТИ

Introduction

To finish our discussion of simple preterites we must consider the verb быти. This verb occupies a unique place in the preterite system of Old East Slavic for two reasons: firstly, it is the only verb used as an auxiliary for the Perfect tenses. Secondly, in addition to the expected Aorist and Imperfect, we find a third set of past tense forms with resemblance to both of these. This intermediate form is usually described in the literature as either a variant form of the Imperfect or as an "imperfective Aorist." The purpose of this chapter will be to investigate the use of the three simple preterite varieties of быти, and to comment on their foregrounding functions. I have found the additional form to be used in the same way as the Imperfect, that is, to express backgrounded events, while foregrounding is the domain of the Aorist.

The Three Types

Unlike other verbs, быти has three simple past tense forms: an Aorist form with the stem бы-, an Imperfect form with бѣа- (the local, contracted form being бя-), and a third form with бѣ-. The last form uses the endings common to the Aorist and Imperfect (for 1sg, 1pl, 2pl, 1du, 2/3du): in the case of the second and third person singular and third person plural, it uses the endings of the Aorist. Thus we find the paradigms shown in Table One.

At first glance the Imperfect and бѣ-forms seem strikingly similar: the vowel ѣ, the mark of the Imperfect in consonantal stems, is present in both. It is as if the contraction of the Old Church Slavonic бѣахъ, for example, proceeded in two directions: i) assimilation to бяахъ and contraction to бяхъ, or ii) simple contraction to бѣхъ. However, the lack of any similar confusion of forms of the Imperfect of other verbs,[1] and the unquestionably Aorist endings of the 3sg/3pl show that the бѣ- forms are, in form, not simply a variant of the Imperfect. Whether they are Imperfects in their meaning or not, however, is another question.

Some scholars, among them van Schooneveld, refer to the бѣ-forms as the "imperfective Aorist" forms of быти. V.V. Ivanov refers to a "другой аорист – с основой бѣ: . . . Этот аорист употреблялся в значении имперфекта."[2] Vlasto, who treats the бѣ- forms as Imperfects, identifies them with Church Slavic: "The frequent forms бѣхъ, etc., in early texts belong to ChSl. [Church Slavic], the anomalous formation (with *aor.*

---

[1]At least in our source; Lunt (Horace G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar (The Hague: Mouton, 1974)) reports this type of confusion - see below.
[2]V.V. Ivanov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1983), p.340.

TABLE ONE: SIMPLEX PRETERITE FORMS OF БЫТИ

person/number	Imperfect[a]	бь—forms	Aorist
1sg	бяхъ	бьхъ	быхъ
2sg/3sg	бяше(ть)[b] (бьаше[ть]) (бьше)	бь	бы(сть)[c]
1pl	бяхомъ	бьхомъ	быхомъ
2pl	бясте	бьсте	бысте
3pl	бяху(ть)(бьаху([ть])	бьша	быша
1du	бяховь	бьховь	быховь
2du/3du[d]	бяста(бьаста, бьяста)	бьста	быста

[a] Forms listed in parentheses are those (uncontracted) Church Slavic forms which occur alongside East Slavic forms in the source text.

[b] The additional -ть appears frequently on third person singular and plural forms.

[c] The additional -сть appears occasionally, never if the form is used to express the Conditional.

[d] Third person dual forms with final e rather than a are not attested by this source text.

terminations) being supplanted by regular бѣяхъ or contracted бяхъ in ESl. and sometimes in ChSl." [3] W.R. Schmalstieg, writing about Old Church Slavonic, enumerates these forms as Imperfects, referring to H.G. Lunt's characterization of them as imperfective Aorists. He also cites grammars by Trubetzkoy, Diels, and Vaillant, in which they are classified as Imperfects.[4]

Lunt himself admits to "some degree of confusion between the closely related imperfect and imperfective aorist [of быти in Old Church Slavic]."[5] He admits to the occurrence of contracted Imperfects with ь instead of ьа or я.[6] And yet, as he points out, compounds of быти, such as забыти or прьбыти, have no бъ- stems in their conjugated forms. Kuznecov calls the бъ- form an Aorist, which "первоначально имела значение имперфекта."[7] Samsonov likewise qualifies his endorsement of бъ as an Aorist: "(форма бьхъ могла быть употреблена и в имперфектном значении)."[8] We will discuss later van Schooneveld's theory of the semantic difference between the "imperfective Aorist" and the Imperfect of быти. First we will examine the functions of the two more common simple pasts of быти, the Aorist and the бъ- forms.

---

[3]A.P. Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), p.149.
[4]William R. Schmalstieg, An Introduction to Old Church Slavic (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1983), p.139.
[5]Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar, p.122.
[6]Ibid., p. 87, p. 122.
[7]P.S. Kuznecov, "Glagol," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Nauka, 1965), p. 271.
[8]N.G. Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973), p. 123.

Functions of the Aorist

There were seventy-two instances of быти Aorists in the twenty page source text. There were also forty-eight бъ- forms and nine Imperfects of быти. The Aorists are used where juncture is explicit or implied. Most of the examples are passive constructions, the passive equivalent of the foregrounded events expressed by active Aorist constructions. Indeed, it stands to reason that there should be a mechanism to express a foregrounded passive action, as the desirability of downgrading the logical subject and upgrading the logical object does not conflict with the need to foreground an event. Particularly common in such constructions are the verbs убити, избити, and язвити. Examples: "В лѣто 6715. Убьенъ бысть царь великыи Филипъ Римьскыи совѣтомъ брата королевое." (242) 'Year 6715: The great Roman emperor Philip was killed at the instigation of the queen's brother.' The actual murderer is unimportant, and is not mentioned. The logical subject may, in other cases, be mentioned in the text:

> В субботу же на ночь попленено бысть около Белза и около Червена Даниломъ и Василкомъ, и вся земля попленена бысть, бояринъ боярина плѣнившю, смердъ смерда, градъ града, якоже не остатися ни единой вси не плѣненьй. (256)
>
> That Saturday night the area around Belz and Červen was pillaged by Danilo and Vasilko and the whole land was pillaged: boyar robbed boyar, peasant robbed peasant, town robbed town, so that not one village remained unpillaged.

Perhaps because of the general pillaging and plundering that was going on, the logical subject in the first verb phrase has been downgraded, but it is mentioned, nevertheless. In the following example, three Passives

allow the author to continue focussing on the group of Hungarian soldiers that are the subject of a preceding Imperfect form: "Нападшимъ же на нь гражаномъ мнозимъ, впадаху в рѣку, инии же избьени быша, инии язвени быша, инии же изоимани быша." (274) 'When a multitude of townsmen attacked them, they fell into the river, others were killed, some were wounded, still others were taken captive.'

A few examples of Aorist Passives show a strong Perfect meaning, repeating events that are already known to the reader, usually in direct quotations: "И послаша ко гражаномъ рекуще: 'Предайтеся, князь вашь ятъ бысть.'" (244) 'They sent a message to the inhabitants, saying: "Give yourselves up, your prince has been captured."' Note here the deliberate use of the Aorist Passive rather than the present tense of быти plus passive participle. This indicates that there is still some degree of focus on the event rather than the result. Compare also: "Прибѣгшимъ же половцемь в Рускую землю, глаголющимъ же имъ рускимъ княземь: 'Яще не поможета намъ, мы нынь исѣчени быхомъ, а вы наутрье исѣчени будете.'" (256) 'When the Polovtsy came to the Rusian[9] land, they said to the Rusian princes: "If you don't help us, as we were beaten (have been beaten) today, so will you be beaten tomorrow."' A very few examples have a very highly stative (Perfect) meaning:

> Видивъ то Мьстиславъ Нѣмый, мнѣвъ, яко Данилъ сбодень бысть, потче и сам в нь, бь бо мужь и тъ крѣпокъ, понеже ужика сый Роману от племени Володимеря, прирокомъ Маномаха. (260)

[9]I use the term 'Rusian' to translate "рускый" wherever it occurs in the text, as the civilization described is essentiallly that of Kievan Rus' and not Modern Russia. Rusian may be considered as equivalent in meaning to 'Old East Slavic'.

Mstislav Nemyj, having seen this, and thinking that Danilo was wounded, himself charged at them, for he was a strong man, a relative of Roman, descendant of Vladimir Monomax.

There are a few instances where the action expressed is secondary, explaining another action: "Жадящю бо ему видити сына своего Данила. Глѣбъ же Зеремьевичь, убьженъ бысть завистью, не пустяше[10] его." (268) 'He greatly wanted to see his son Danilo. Gleb Zeremeevič, stricken with envy, would not let him.' The Aorist + passive participle appears to function as an explanation for the Imperfect action, and not a foregrounded event in itself. The construction Aorist of быти + passive participle accounts for fifty of the seventy-two occurrences of быти Aorists.

The use of быти Aorist Passive constructions with strong Perfect meanings and expressing events supplementary to the main events suggests use on the level of background events for at least a few of the fifty instances. The majority seem to be "Passivized" foreground Aorists. These few seem to be Passivized Perfects. In theory, a Passive Perfect should have the structure Perfect of быти + passive participle of the main verb. This idealized construction never occurs in the source text, and it may well be that the быти Aorist Passives are being extended to fill the gap.

In another twelve cases, the use of the Aorist of быти expresses an action which would likely be expressed by another past perfective verb in the modern language, as modern быть is quite definitely imperfective. The use of быти as an inceptive verb is noted: "По сем же долгу времени минувшю, мятежь бысть межи братома и Володимеромъ и Романомъ." (240) 'A long time after this, a quarrel began between the

[10] Note that the Pamjatniki edition has „пустяще", whereas the Polnoe sobranie has „пустяше."

brothers Volodimer and Roman.', i.e. perfective 'начался' 'began'.[11] In some cases there is a sense of 'arrival' rather than 'being': "И послаша ко гражаномъ рекуще: 'Предайтеся, князь вашь ятъ бысть.' Оньмо же не имущимъ вѣры, донележе извѣсто бысть имъ, и предашася звенигородьци." (244) 'They sent a message to the inhabitants, saying: "Give yourselves up, your prince has been captured." They didn't believe it until word came to them, and then the Zvenigorodians surrendered.' That is to say, "Пока вести не дошли (perfective) до них." Other normally perfective uses are represented as well. The быти Aorist can express a momentary action : "Василкови угонившу его, кликъ бысть великъ: 'Братъ ти биетъся назади.'" (266) 'Vasilko having caught up to him, there arose a great cry: "Your brother is fighting behind you."', ("Издался [perfective] крик"). It can also express an inceptive action: "Гнавъ же Данилъ ко мосту и узрѣвъ, яко коньчь мосту угаслъ есть, и бысть радость велика." (272) 'Danilo rode up to the bridge and saw that the end of the bridge had stopped burning, and there was great rejoicing.', (ie. "Они обрадовалися [perfective]").

In five instances the Aorist form is used with short yearly entries when there are no events to report: the entire entry for the year 6722 reads as follows: "Въ лѣто 6722. Бысть тишина." (252) 'Year 6722: (then) there was peace.' A similar entry, but with the subject and verb reversed, occurs on page 254. The other sub-type of this category is represented by: "Въ лѣто 6724. Не бысть ничто же." (252) 'Year 6724: There was

[11] The Modern Russian perfective equivalents of the Aorists of быти suggested in this paragraph are my own proposals.

nothing. (Nothing happened.)' Although this meaning is somewhat different from the other uses of the Aorist of быти, (in particular that it seems to be imperfective rather than perfective and not at all foregrounded), it is regularly used in these types of entries. Perhaps the association with a definite time requires a foregrounding verb. In fact, the entry does give an explanation of what came between sequenced events, and can thereby be considered as needing a sequencing verb, i.e. an Aorist.

Functions of the бь- forms

The бь- forms without the l-participle (i.e. not the Pluperfect)[12] are used less frequently than the Aorists, occurring forty-eight times in the twenty page source text. Forty-five of these were without participles, in the usual meanings of бытѝ in the past tense: to describe, to indicate location, and to show existence. Of the first sub-type, we have the following examples: "Бь бо томитель бояромъ и гражаномъ."(242) 'For he was a tormentor of boyars and townsfolk.' and "Пакославъ бо бь приятель и Романовой и дьтемь ея." (248) 'For Pakoslav was a friend to Roman's wife and her children.' An example giving a less subjective description: "Бь бо возрастомъ 18 льтъ, бь бо силенъ." (260) 'For he was 18 years old and strong."

In its locative meaning of "Он был там" we also find numerous examples: "Бь бо Инъгваръ с ляхы и Мьстиславъ." (240) 'Ingvar and Mstislav were with the Poles.' and, negated: "Василка же не бь, бь бо в Володимерь млад." (258) 'Vasilko was not there, for he was in

[12]The frequencies of the three competing forms of быти in the Pluperfect are treated in Chapter Six.

Volodimer because of his youth.' Finally, in the existential sense of "было" compare: "И за то не смьша галичань ничтоже створити, бь бо иньхъ много угоръ." (238) 'Because of this the Galicians did not dare try anything, for there were many other Hungarians.', and "Олександру же отступившю от Данила и от Василка ко Лестькови, не бь бо има помощи ни от кого же, развье от бога, дондеже приде Мьстиславъ с половци." (254) 'Alexander having deserted Danilo and Vasilko for Lest'ko, they had [there was] help from no one save God until Mstislav came with the Polovtsy.'

This form can also be combined with имети, 'to have', to indicate what would today simply be expressed by the past form of имети. The form of имети can be the present participle: "Оному же хотящю поручити домъ свой и дьти в руць его, бь бо имья до него любовь велику во сердць своемь." (268) 'He wanted to entrust his house and children to him, for he had a great love for him in his heart.' In one case, the imperfect of имети is used: "Бь бо имьяшеть лесть во сердци своемь, не хотяше бо пагубы королеви, имьяше бо в немь надежу велику." (264) 'For he had evil in his heart, he did not wish the death of the king, he placed great hopes in him.'

There are, unfortunately, a few examples of Aorists that seem to be used in the same way as the бь- forms. For example: "Дьмьянъ же одинако крьпяшеся, грозы его не убояся. Богъ поспьшникъ бысть ему." (274) 'Dem'jan, however, was firm, his threats did not frighten him. God was his helper.', it is posssible that juncture is implied, i.e the modern perfective: "Бог **оказался** помощником ему." 'God **proved** to be his helper.' More problematic are the following

three examples: "Юрья же князя великого Суждальского не бы в том свьтъ." (258) 'The great prince Jurij of Suzdal was not at that council.', which could be viewed as the equivalent of the modern perfective "он не **явился** туда" 'he did not **appear** there'— perhaps it would be expected that he be there.

> Мьстислав же прия зятя своего любовью и почестивъ его великими дарми, и да ему конь свой борзый актазъ, акого же в та льта не бысть, и дочерь свою Янну даривъ великими дарами. (262)
>
> Mstislav received his son-in-law with great affection, and, having honoured him with great gifts, gave him his charger Aktaz, such a horse as there was none other at that time, and he gave his daughter Anna valuable gifts.

and "Измлада бо не бы има покоя." (266) 'Since their youth they had [to them was] no peace.' I can offer no satisfactory explanation for these instances, which occur in all three versions of the text.

There are also three instances of бь- forms used with passive participles in the first twenty pages of source text. These are passive events which occurred deeper in the past, and are not foregrounded, but used to express a resulting state or circumstance: "Василка же Юрьи попъ с кормилицею возмя, изыиде дырею градною, не вьдяху бо, камо бьжаще, бь бо Романъ убьенъ на ляхохъ, а Лестко мира не створилъ." (238) 'The priest Jurij and the nurse took Vasilko away through a hole in the city wall, and didn't know where to flee to, for Roman was killed at war with Poland, and Lestko had not made peace.' The other two instances show especially clearly the idea of a state: "Бь бо градъ створенъ на церкви" (254) 'For the church had been fortified.' and "Потомь же Ростиславъ Пиньскый не престаяше клевеща,

бѣша бо дѣти его изыманы." (268) 'Then Rostislav of Pinsk did not cease to slander, as his children had been taken captive.' If we compare these examples to those examples of the Aorist of быти plus passive participle (see the beginning of this section), we find that these examples express events which had happened much earlier, while the construction with the Aorist expresses events then taking place — related to the story line. The difference between them seems to be the length of time elapsed since the action took place. The use of the бъ-forms here parallels their use in the Pluperfect.

Бъ- forms vs. Imperfects

The basis of van Schooneveld's description is that every distinct grammatical preterite form has a unique meaning, and that combinations of varying forms making up the compound tenses form composite meanings made up of the sum of the parts. He also concludes that the various forms of быти (treated as perfective Aorist, imperfective Aorist, and Imperfect) are not any different from other verbs in those same grammatical categories:

> 2. The Old Russian pluperfects and other compounds with быти are all distinguished by the same semantic differences which are found again in the preterites of *byti;*
>
> 3. The preterites of *byti* have the same semantic distinctions which characterize the Old Russian finite preterite system in general; . . .[13]

This reasoning means, for example, that van Schooneveld finds the Pluperfect with a Perfect auxiliary[14] semantically different from the Pluperfect with an Imperfect auxiliary, which is different again from a Pluperfect with an

---

[13]C.H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('s-Gravenhague: Mouton, 1959), p. 165.

[14]For example "Я везлъ есмь былъ." or "Я везлъ былъ."

imperfective Aorist auxiliary. In so doing he rejects the traditional view that the Pluperfect with Perfect auxiliary was simply a newer form of the Pluperfect which arose as a result of the demise of the Imperfect and Aorist.[15]

His assessment of the Imperfect forms of быти is that they denote episodes synchronized with an action mentioned in the context or coordinated with some fact in the past implied by the utterance, or in a closed, independent episode. The бъ- forms denote consecutive events or new facts brought in for argumentation.[16] He also states that Imperfects elaborate with descriptive details,[17] and

> that in opposition to бяше (the imperfect, denoting a simultaneous episode) бъхъ introduces the process rather brusquely; it does not, like бяше, denote an event which lies beside the chain of events, but one which is itself rather a link in the chain.[18]

For our purposes then, we may assume that if van Schooneveld is correct, the Imperfects should express backgrounded events in relation to the бъ- forms. In fact, there are some examples of бъ- forms which would seem to be substituting for Imperfects:

> Одолѣвша всимъ поганьскымъ языком ума мудростью, ходяша по заповѣдемь божимъ: устремил бо ся бяше на поганыя, яко и левъ, сердитъ же бъ[19], яко и рысь, и губяше, яко и коркодилъ; и прехожаше землю ихъ, яко и орелъ, храборъ бо бъ, яко и туръ. (236)

---

[15]See for example Kuznecov, "Glagol," p. 296, V.V. Ivanov, "Istorija vremennyx form glagola," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Nauka, 1982), p. 109, Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk, p.134.

[16]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, pp. 60-69.

[17]Ibid., p.69.

[18]Ibid., p.65.

[19]The Hypatian Codex has бысть here, бъ, in the Xlebnikovskij and Podgodinskij texts, seems more in keeping with the rest of the passage.

He defeated all the heathen nations, in his wisdom walked according to the commandments of God; he had pounced upon the heathens like a lion, was wild, like a lynx, and wrought destruction, like a crocodile, and passed through their lands, like an eagle, he was brave, like an aurochs.

Roman's whole life is characterized here, and бъ occurs among Imperfects. A similar example is:

Бѣгаше бо Тимофей от лиця его. Бѣ бо томитель бояромъ и гражаномъ. И блудъ творя и оскверняху жены же и черници и попадьи. В правду бѣ антихристъ за скверная дѣла его. (242)

Timothy fled from him. For he was a torturer of boyars and townsfolk, committing lecherous acts and defiling women, including nuns and priests' wives. In truth he was the Antichrist because of his foul deeds.

There are only nine examples of быти Imperfects functioning independently in the twenty page source text. In five instances, the Imperfects are adjacent to the бъ- forms. In such situations, van Schooneveld suggests that either the бъ- forms present new facts while the Imperfects coordinate the whole episode, or that the бъ- forms present facts in succession, while the Imperfects provide elaborations.[20] The former explanation may hold true for one example:

Данило и Василка Романовичю бѣаху володимьрьскыи пискупь: бѣ бо Асафъ блаженый преподобный, святитель Святое Горы, и потомъ бѣ Василь от Святое Горы, и потомъ бѣ Микифоръ, прирокомъ Станило, бѣ бо слуга Василковъ преже, и потомъ Кузма, кроткый преподобный смиреный пискупъ володимерьскый. (256)

During the time of Danilo and Vasilko Romanovič there were in Volodimer these bishops: there was Asaf, blessed and venerable prelate of the Holy Mountain [Monastery], and then there was Vasily from the Holy Mountain, and then there was Mikofor, who was called

[20]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, p.67, p.69.

Stanilo, who previously was a servant of Vasilko's, and then Kuzma, the gentle, venerable humble bishop of Volodimer.

For others neither explanation seems to be satisfactory. In the following example:

> Лестько же поя Данила ис Каменца, а Олександра из Володимера, а Всеволода из Белза, когождо ихъ со своими вои. Бѣ бо вои Даниловъ болши и крѣплѣйши, бяху бояре велиции отца его вси у него. (248)

> Lestko took Danilo from Kamenec, Alexander from Volodimer, and Vsevolod from Belz, each one with their soldiers. Danilo's soldiers were bigger and stronger, for with him were all the great boyars of his father's.

neither fact is new, both are elaborations. In the following passage all three preterite forms of быти are used:

> Тогда бо бѣахуть[21] Мьстиславъ Романовичь в Кыевѣ, а Мьстиславъ в Козельскѣ и Черниговѣ, а Мьстиславъ Мьстиславичь в Галичѣ, то бо бѣаху старѣйшины в Руской земли. Юрья же князя великого Суждальского не бы в том свѣтѣ. Се же паки млади князи Данилъ Романовичь, Михаилъ Всеволодичь, Всеволодъ Мьстиславичь Кыевьскый, инии мнозии князи. Тогда же великый князь половецкый крестися Басты Василка же не бѣ, бѣ бо в Володимерѣ млад. (258)

> At that time reigned Mstislav Romanovič in Kiev, Mstislav in Kozel'sk and Černigov, and Mstislav Mstislavič in Halyč, they were the senior princes in the Rusian land. The great prince Jurij of Suzdal was not at that council. The junior princes were Danilo Romanovič, Mixail Vsevolodič, Vsevolod Mstislavič of Kiev and many other princes. At that time the great Polovtsian prince Basty was baptized. Vasilko was not there, he was in Volodimer because of his youth.

Each one of these forms constitutes an elaboration, the whole episode being coordinated in the preceding sentences: "Бывшю же свѣту всих

---

[21] The Xlebnikovskij and Pogodinskij versions have бѣ here.

князьй во градь Кыевь, створиша свѣть сице: 'Луче ны бы есть прияти я на чюжей земль, нежели на своей.' Тогда бо бѣахуть[21] . . . ." (256-8) 'There was a council of all the princes in the city of Kiev, and they decided thus: "Better for us to engage them in a foreign land, than in our own." At that time reigned . . .'

In fact, in terms of discourse functions, I have found no difference between the бь- forms and the few Imperfects, whereas these two categories are unlike the Aorists in their functions. Like the бь- forms, the Imperfects are used to indicate location, and show existence, as in the above examples, or to characterize, as in the following instance: "И приѣха берестьяне ко Лестькови и просиша Романовыи княгини и дѣтии, бѣаста бо млада сущи." (240) 'And the people of Berest' came to Lest'ko and asked for Roman's wife and her children, for they were young.'

Conclusions

Thus there are basically two types of быти preterites operating in the foregrounding/backgrounding system: the Aorists, which are used to express foregrounded events at a juncture, like other Aorists, and the Imperfects, including the бь- forms, which express backgrounded events, elaborations of the situation or characters involved in the main plot line. In this respect the preterites of быти are no different from other verbs in these two grammatical categories. The Aorist of быти can also function like various modern perfective verbs (i.e. its lexical meaning was broader than modern быть), it is preferred in short yearly entries, or as the passive equivalent of a foregrounded Aorist. It can sometimes act as the passive equivalent of a

Perfect. Бъ-forms can be used to passively express states or circumstances resulting from much earlier events, i.e. the passive equivalent of a Pluperfect; along with Imperfects, they are used, like modern быть, to describe, indicate location, and show existence. In view of the identity of foregrounding/backgrounding function of the бъ-forms with the Imperfects in the GVC, it is difficult to disagree with those scholars, such as Vlasto, Schmalstieg, Trubetzkoy, Diels, and Vaillant, who consider such forms to be Imperfects. Thus van Schooneveld's distinction between these two forms is not supported by this text. A conclusion applicable to Old East Slavic in general, however, would require a broader examination of various sources, which is beyond the scope of this investigation.

CHAPTER SIX

THE PLUPERFECT

Introduction

In the case of the relatively infrequent Pluperfect tense (either "давнопрошедшее время" or "плюсквамперфект" in the Soviet literature), I have examined the corpus of instances found in the entire fifty-seven pages of the Galician half of the chronicle. There are seventy-seven instances of the Pluperfect, which in Old East Slavic is formed by a preterite of the verb быти, 'to be', plus the l-participle of the content verb. The three different forms of the auxiliary verb, discussed in the preceding chapter, are found in the Pluperfect: the бѣ-form (fifty-three instances), in the Imperfect (twenty-three instances) and, in a single instance, in the Aorist tense. The purpose of this chapter will be to examine the three types of Pluperfect to see how they differ and what role they perform in the foregrounding and backgrounding system. It will be found that the difference in auxiliaries does not consistently play a role: when it does, the Imperfect limits the state resulting from the prior action, the бѣ-form allows the state to extend in time,

The Pluperfect in general is used to explain or motivate other events, to describe or identify an actor, or, less commonly, to convey important events which happened at a prior point on the time line and are only now revealed.

Aorist Plus l-participle

The Aorist of быти as an auxiliary verb plus the l-participle of the main verb expresses the Conditional tense in Old Russian, and sometimes in Old Church Slavonic.[1] (In our source text this is the only form of the Conditional found.) Vlasto, however, refers to the existence of examples of the Pluperfect with быхъ, i.e. the Aorist.[2] Indeed, there is one example of this in our source text: "Но мы на преднее возвратимся, якоже преже почали быхомъ" (242) 'But we shall return to the earlier part, which we had previously begun [to tell].' No substantive conclusions can be drawn from a single example, and no obvious distinctions between this example and the remainder with other forms of the auxiliary present themselves, it is clear that there is some confusion between this form of the Pluperfect and the Conditional.

Бъ-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Theory

Opinions vary on the significance of the two main competing forms: бъ-forms plus l-participle vs. Imperfect plus l-participle. Kuznecov finds that the бъ-forms predominate in the fourteenth and fifteenth century copies of the

---

[1]See Horace G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p.98; William R. Schmalstieg, An Introduction to Old Church Slavic (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1983), p.157; and G.A. Xaburgaev, Staroslavjanskij jazyk (Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1974), p.291, for OCS and V.N. Belousov, "Istorija form soslagatel'nogo naklonenija," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Nauka, 1982), p.154, and P.S. Kuznecov, "Glagol," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Nauka, 1965), p.288, for Old Russian.

[2]A.P. Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), p.160.

Tale of Bygone Years while the Imperfect predominates in OCS and church monuments.[3] On the other hand, W.K. Matthews refers to the бъ-forms as being of OCS origin.[4] Similarly, Vlasto states: "The pluperfect is properly formed with the *imperfect* бяхъ (occasionally with the *imperf aor.* бѣхъ in ChSl.) . . . "[5] Both of these types were eventually replaced by a new Pluperfect, in which the auxiliary быти took the form of the Perfect, often the elliptic form, i.e. the new Pluperfect was the l-participle of быти, without the auxiliary verb, plus the l-participle of the main verb. This is the type van Schooneveld refers to as the Double Perfect, and is not represented in the source text.

The Pluperfect with бъ-forms is not found in the Volynian half of the chronicle, which was written by someone else and at a later time. In fact, бъ-forms do not occur at all in the Volynian portion, even as independent verbs. Perfecky points to this fact as an indication of the lack of Church Slavic influence in this half.[6]

Writing about OCS, Lunt sketches a difference in meaning between these two varieties of Pluperfect.[7] His remarks echo those of van Schooneveld, who wrote about Old Russian: the l-participle plus бъ indicates "that there was a moment in the past in which one could look back upon an anterior objective fact."[8] The "objective fact" is the event expressed

---

[3]P.S. Kuznecov, Očerki istoričeskoi morfologii russkogo jazyka (Moskva: Akademija nauk, 1959), p.214.
[4]W.K. Matthews, Russian Historical Grammar (London: Athlone Press, 1960), p.124, p.208.
[5]Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century , p.160.
[6]George A. Perfecky, "Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle," The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, XII:1-2 (1969-1972), p.105.
[7]Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar, p.98.
[8]C.H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('s-Gravenhague: Mouton, 1959), p.128.

by the l-participle which makes an event objective, taking it out of the surrounding context. The auxiliary determines when this retrospection takes place. The Perfect (the l-participle with the Present of быти) expresses a retrospection at the moment of the utterance (see the chapter on the Perfect.) The бъ-form auxiliary, being an (imperfective) Aorist, ensures that the retrospection takes place at a moment, presumably at some past reference time. The l-participle plus the Imperfect of быти indicates either "the retrospection . . . is synchronized with another (contextually given) happening in the later past;" or "the retrospection forms a self-contained episode, that is, retrospection was possible only then."[9] This results from van Schooneveld's conception of the Imperfect: the mode of expression of synchronization or an action which leaves no result. He describes the бъ-Pluperfects as "giving a new piece of information", "placing the pluperfect on the enumerative chain", (i.e. retrospection as a plot line occurrence), "giving a fact from an earlier story, reintroducing information anew"[10] (as opposed to repeating information within the same story).

The Pluperfects with быти Imperfects can indicate an independent action, synchronized and coincidentally so with another event, identification of an actor through a prior action within the same story or episode, or a circumstance pertaining exclusively to a situation.[11] To summarize this theory, the use of the Imperfect auxiliary limits the resultant state of a prior action by synchronizing it to a plot line event or by limiting the state to that part of the plot; the use of a бъ-form auxiliary allows the resultant state of a prior action to hold true for a period of time beyond the episode, and to

---

[9]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, p.128.
[10]Ibid., pp.125-131.
[11]Ibid., pp.129-132.

occupy a spot on the plot line between other sequenced events. In other words, the distinction between the competing forms is an aspectual one, paralleling the distinction between the Aorist and the Imperfect. The retrospection is thus either an Aorist-type event in the chain of successive plot line events, or an Imperfect type background simultaneous event.

Бъ-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Practice

There are many instances in the source text where the theory seems to fit: most of them, in fact, can be argued to be so. Notable is the use of "в то (же) время":

> Придоша Галичане на Каменець и вси Болоховьсции князи с ними, и повоеваша по Хомору, и поидоша-ко Каменцю, вземши полонъ великъ, поидоша. В то же время послалъ бяше Володимиръ Данилови помощь Торцькыи Данила Нажировича. (286)
>
> The Galicians marched against Kamenec accompanied by all the Boloxovian princes and waged war along the Xomor, and went towards Kamenec, and, having taken many prisoners, left. At the same time Volodimir had sent Torks and Danilo Nažirovič to help Danilo.

Here "в то же время" is used to indicate the simultaneity of the result of a prior action (the Torks are coming) with the other events on the plot line. There are a total of five cases where "в то время" or "в то же время" is used with a Pluperfect. In four of these the purpose seems to be the expression of simultaneity of a state with an another plot development, and in these cases, as in the above example, the Imperfect auxiliary is used. In the fifth case, "в то время" is used not to coordinate events on the current plot line, but to clarify a flashback, i.e. not meaning 'at the same time', but rather 'at that (other) time.':

Древле бо того прислалъ к нему пискупа Береньского и Каменецького, река ему: „И прими вѣньць королевьства".Он в то же время не приялъ бъ, рька: „Ратъ татарьская не престаеть эль живущи с нами, то како могу прияти вѣньць бес помощи твоей". (330)

Even before this he sent the Bishop of Bern and Kamenec to Danilo, saying "Accept a royal crown." But at that time Danilo had refused to accept it, saying "The Tatar warriors do not cease to live at enmity with us, so how can I accept a crown from you, without receiving your assistance?"

In this case, the бъ-form rather than the Imperfect is used. Here there is no simultaneity: "в то же время" is used to highlight the contrast between the following **sequenced** event (within the flashback) and the current moment in the plot (outside the flashback), where Danilo is about to accept the crown he had earlier refused. The distinction between the two meanings could be realized in Modern Russian by "в то же самое время" (simultaneity) and "в то (же) время" or "тогда" (at that time).

The limitedness of a state and its synchronization to a larger plot line event is illustrated by the following example with the Imperfect auxiliary: "И приьхавша подъ Завихвостъ, стрьли Василко князь чересъ рьку Вислу, не могоша бо переьхати ей рькы, понеже наводнилася бяше." (304) 'They came to Zavixvost, and Prince Vasilko shot an arrow across the Vistula — they could not cross the river, because it had become flooded.' This is what van Schooneveld would call "retrospection possible only then" — the state is not a lasting one, and in any event is important only inasmuch as it coincides, accidentally, with the need to cross the river.

By contrast, in the following example the state is directly related to plot line events: "Данилови же приѣхавшу ко Галичю, Галичь бо бѣ ся затворилъ." (272) 'When Danilo arrived at Halyč, the town had been closed up.' The state of the town's gates being closed is a result of the expectation of the arrival of Danilo and his forces. Here, unlike the previous example, where the army retreated, having been at that time unable to cross the river, this state continues on through several other plot line events, until the city surrenders. Unlike the preceding example, this state is assuredly a response to a prospective plot line event and is inherently wound up with the plot. As a response to a plot line event, the state is itself more of a plot line event than the previous example, and this Pluperfect uses the бѣ-form auxiliary.

Similarly the contrast between an event recalled from the same episode and an event recalled from the deeper past can be illustrated in the following examples. At the end of a campaign by Rostislav to seize Galicia, the chronicler recalls the beginning of the episode: "Про то бо из угоръ пришелъ бяшеть съ женою в Лядьскую землю, мысляще во умь своемь взяти Галичь и обладати имъ." (312) 'The reason he had come to Poland from Hungary with his wife was that he was planning to seize Galicia and rule over it.' Compare the following: "Михаилъ Черниговьскый – 'яко бо бѣ отець его постриглъ отца моего', бѣ бо ему боязнь велика во сердци его." (268) 'Mixail of Černigov had great fear in his heart, "for his father had forced my father to become a monk."' Here an event is recalled not from this episode, but from a time a generation before, as Prince Roman, the father referred to here, had died twenty-three years prior.

However, there are a number of examples which seem to contradict van Schooneveld's theory. An episode which had taken place thirty-six years before is recalled in the following passage: "Оному же не возмогшу, куда утечи, и возбьже на комары церковая, идеже безаконьи угрь возбьгли бьаху." (334) 'He had nowhere to flee, and he climbed up onto the church vault, just as the lawless Hungarians had done.' Yet a fact recalled, not from the same episode, but from the deeper past is supposed to be expressed by the Pluperfect with бъ.

Sometimes the two forms of the Pluperfect are used in adjacent clauses, in this instance without apparent motivation:

> Слышавъ же Данилъ приходъ Ростиславль со князи Болоховьскими на Бакоту, абье устремися на нь, грады ихъ огневи предасть, и гребля ихъ раскопа. Василько же князь осталъ бъ стеречи земль от Литвы, послалъ бъаше вое свое со братомъ. (300)
>
> Having heard about Rostislav's march with the Boloxovian princes against Baxota, Danilo immediately set on them, put their towns to the torch and dug up their fortifications. Prince Vasilko had remained behind to guard the land from the Lithuanians, he had sent his soldiers with his brother.

In this case, it could be argued that both Pluperfects express states simultaneous to Danilo's campaign, or they could both be sequenced events. It is difficult to rationalize their being different types of Pluperfect.

In the following passage, the бъ-forms are used where the Imperfect auxiliary may have been more appropriate:

> Изяславъ же одинако не престааше, возвелъ бъ полвць на Киевъ. Данилъ бо и вои его бъ иструдилася. Поплънилъ бо бъ всь Черниговьскые страны, воевалъ бо бъ от Крещениа до Вознесениа, створи миръ, воротися

Кыеву. Половцем же пришедшимъ Киеву и плѣнящимъ землю Рускую. Данилъ бо бѣ изнемогълъся (284)

Izjaslav, however, was not giving up, he had called forth Polovtsy against Kiev. Danilo and his troops were exhausted. For he had pillaged the whole country around Černigov, he had fought from Epiphany to Ascension Day, he made peace and returned to Kiev. The Polovtsy having come to Kiev and ravaging the Rusian land, Danilo was exhausted (had become exhausted).

The underlined verbs expresses simultaneous states resulting from simultaneous actions: they are not successive on the plot line. As such, they should have been expressed by the Pluperfect with Imperfect auxiliary.

A large majority of instances are found not to contradict van Schooneveld's theory; some can be argued either way. The presence of the above counterexamples calls the theory into question as it applies to this text. I believe that the main problem is that the бѣ-forms are of Church Slavic origin: inasmuch as this Old East Slavic chronicle deviates from Church Slavic norms, we can expect confusion between бѣ-forms and and быти Imperfects. Nevertheless, in comparing usage among Pluperfects with usage among the non-Aorist simple preterites of быти, dealt with in the preceding chapter, there seems to be a more easily-identifiable and consistent, if not entirely consistent, division in the former. The latter does not show such a division. If we accept that the dichotomy of usage is not representative of the local living language, the influence of which is felt in this text, then we need explain only the usage of the Pluperfect in general in the foregrounding/backgrounding system.

Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Other Possible Explanations

No obvious lexical motivation is found for the division of бь-Pluperfects vs. Imperfect auxiliary-Pluperfects. While many verbs appear frequently with consistently one or the other type of auxiliary, (e.g., прияти 'to take, to receive', дати 'to give', воевати 'to wage war', with бь; прити 'to come, to arrive on foot', устремити ся 'to rush' with the Imperfect auxiliary), six verbs are used with both auxiliaries : послати 'to send', изнемочи 'to become exhausted', затворити ся 'to lock oneself in, to shut oneself up in', возвести 'to summon up', ьхати 'to go, to ride', and поити 'to go'. It is interesting to note that while приьхати 'to come, to arrive on horseback' occurs only as a бь-Pluperfect, прити 'to come, to arrive on foot' occurs only as a бяше-Pluperfect.

Similarly, both perfective and imperfective verbs, as well as verbs which are neither consistently perfective nor consistently imperfective (крестити 'to christen', иструдити ся 'to become weary', идти 'to go', ьхати 'to go, to ride', быти 'to be') appear with either auxiliary. Seventy-two percent of the бь-Pluperfects, and seventy-eight percent of the бяше-Pluperfects are perfective verbs. It must be concluded that there is no significant correlation between aspect and the choice of auxiliary in the Pluperfect.

Бь-form or Imperfect Plus l-participle: Negation

Analysis of the negated Pluperfects show an interesting division of usage. There are eight instances of negated Pluperfects in the fifty seven page source text. Five of these are imperfective verbs: a higher proportion than among all Pluperfects, and not surprising considering the negation. In

the case of the perfective verbs, the auxiliary is always бъ, and there is always a clearly implied time point associated with the inaction — the point at which the action would have occurred, as in the following example: "Древле бо того прислалъ к нему пискупа Береньского и Каменецького, река ему: 'И приими вѣньць королевьства'. Он в то время не приялъ бъ . . ." (330) 'Even before this he sent the Bishop of Bern and Kamenec to Danilo, saying "Accept a royal crown." But at that time Danilo had not accepted it . . .'

In four of the five instances of imperfective verbs the auxiliary бъ is used: the common factor in these is the prior absence of an action until the current moment in the plot. After an account of a successful campaign against the Jatvingians, the chronicler writes: "По великомъ бо князь Романь никто же не бъ воевалъ на нь в рускихъ князих, развье сына его Данила." (338) 'For since great Prince Roman, no Rusian prince had waged war against them except his son Danilo.' Thus in these instances too, a point is time is implied: the point at which the negation ceases to be true. The only other instance of a negated Pluperfect also involves an imperfective verb, but this one has an Imperfect auxiliary: "В то же время ѣхалъ бяше Данилъ Угры королеви и еще бо бящеть не слышалъ приходъ поганыхъ татаръ на Кыевъ." (296) 'At that time Danilo had gone to Hungary, to see the king, and had not yet heard of the attack of the heathen Tatars on Kiev.' In this case no specific point of time is envisaged for the event in question, which is Danilo's hearing of the attack on Kiev. Danilo could have heard of the attack at any time following the event — he did not, nor is he now informed of the event. Although the number of negated Imperfects is small, they do suggest an

interesting hypothesis: perfective verb plus бъ-form for the absence of action at some point in the plot, imperfective verb plus бъ-form auxiliary for absence of action before that point in the plot, and imperfective verb plus Imperfect auxiliary for absence of action where no point in the plot is suggested.

The Pluperfect in General in Foregrounding/Backgrounding

The use of the Pluperfect in the source text clearly demonstrates a state resulting from a prior action. The role of this state in the foregrounding system varies: most frequently it explains or motivates foregrounded events: "Данилъ же в то время шелъ бяше со братомъ Угры ко королевы, бъ бо звалъ его на честь." (288) 'That same year Danilo had gone with his brother to Hungary to see the king, for he had invited him to a celebration.'

In some cases, the events indicated by the Pluperfect are themselves important, foregrounded events, and are expressed by Pluperfects only because they are revealed as news, i.e. something important happened while our attention was focussed elsewhere:

> Присла король угорьскы к Данилу, прося его на помощь, бъ бо имъ рать на бой с ньмци. Иде ему на помощь и приде къ Пожгу. Пришли бо бяху посли ньмьцкыи к нему. (318-20)
>
> The Hungarian king sent [word] to Danilo, requesting his help, as at that time he was at war with the Germans. Danilo went to help him and came to Požg. For German envoys had come to him.

In some cases, this use of the Pluperfect serves as an indication that the event named did not depend on the preceding foregrounded event expressed in the text.

The Pluperfect may identify an actor by referring to an action he had undertaken:

> И многи крестьяны от пленения избависта, и пьснь славну пояху има, богу помогшу има, и придоста со славою на землю свою, наследивши путь отца своего великаго Романа, иже бѣ изоостридся на поганыя, яко левъ, имже половци дьти страшаху. (318)
>
> And they freed many Christians, who sang to them a song of praise, God having helped them, and they returned in glory to their land, following in the footsteps of their father, the great Roman, who had pounced upon the heathens, like a lion, with whom the Polovtsy frightened their children.

It can also be a descriptive device, making use of the state resulting from a prior action: "Баты порокы городу подъль вратъ Лядьскьх. Ту бо бѣаху пришли дебри." (294) 'Baty set up catapults against the city at Ljadskie Vorota. The ravines covered in foliage had come (came) right up to here.'

Alternatively, the Pluperfect may express an event which has since been annulled:

> Наутрья же приде к нему вѣсть, яко Ростиславъ пошелъ бѣ к Галичю, слышавъ же приятье градьское, бѣжа во Угры путемь, им же идяше на Боръсуков Дьлъ, и прииде к Бани, рекомьй Родна, и оттуда иде Угры. (288)
>
> The next day he received word that Rostislav had set out for Halyč, but, learning that the city was taken, went off to Hungary by the road to the

Borsukov mountain ridge: he came to the hot springs called Rodna and from there went to Hungary.

It should be pointed out that even an annulled event can be an important contribution to the development of the plot, although clearly not with the same significance as a foregrounded event.

Thus we see that the Pluperfect is connected in two different ways to the foregrounded plot line events: they may add information about the events or their instigators, or they may express events which, while foregrounded, do not fall on the plot line where we would expect, or in order to introduce new participants.

Conclusions

The Pluperfect in the source text serves to supplement the meaning of the foregrounded events expressed by other forms, through description, identification of actors, or explanation, justification. It can also serve to express foregrounded events which either do not occur in the expected successive portion of the plot line, or occur on a separate plot line, for example to introduce new participants. In some instances, it is possible that the choice of the form of the auxiliary verb is motivated by a desire to limit the state expressed (Imperfect auxiliary) or to allow the state to be independent of other events (бѣ-form auxiliary). This distinction, however, is not consistently upheld throughout the source text and may be reflective of a Church Slavonicized or archaic state of Old East Slavic. The possibility of confirming this possibility rests in examining older and more recent texts for comparison in their use of the Pluperfect auxiliaries.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE PERFECT

Introduction: The Meaning of the Perfect

Although the Perfect does not vary its auxiliary in the same way as the Pluperfect, it provides even more room for debate as to its function. The meaning of the Perfect is usually described as indication of a past action with a result that continues to the moment of speaking.[1] As it was the elliptic Perfect, that is, the
l-participle alone without the auxiliary verb, that in time replaced the other preterite tenses in East Slavic, we would expect there to have been a period when the semantic role of the Perfect expanded beyond this definition.

The evidence of our source text suggests that the Perfect is not as restricted as has been characterized, both in its domain (direct quotation vs. narrative discourse) and in the role played by its form (the presence or absence of its auxiliary verb). A different view is held by van Schooneveld.

[1]See N.G. Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973), p.130.

His theory states that the Perfect objectivizes the event by taking it out of the context (the event being anterior to the main context of the utterance).[2] This has implications for the grounding system of the language.

He points out that in order to present an event as an objectively known fact, it need not be known as such by both speaker and addressee: if it is, then the verb makes an assertion. As an example he cites the following: "'И послаша к нему, глаголюще: „Почто идеши опять? Поималъ еси всю дань.'" And they sent messengers to him, saying: 'Why are you coming again? You took [have taken] the whole tribute!"[3] If the semantic content is known objectively except by the addressee, then the verb is being used for persuasion. Thus he cites the following: "'. . . бяше бо мужь твой аки волкъ восхищая и грабя, а наши князи добри суть, иже распали суть Деревьску землю . . .'. . . for your husband was theiving and rapacious as a wolf. But our princes are good, for they saved [have saved] the Derevlian land . . ."[4]

The content expressed may be unknown to both speaker and addressee, i.e. its validity questioned. Among the examples of this he offers: "'Ини же, не свѣдуще, рекоша, яко Кий есть перевозникъ былъ' Others, not knowing it [correctly], said that Kij was [had been] a ferryman."[5] Finaliy, if the content becomes known to the speaker only at that moment, then the verb is expressing a conclusion, as in: "'Рече има Янь: „Поистинѣ прельстилъ вас есть бѣсь . . .'" Jan' said to them:

---

[2]C.H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('s-Gravenhague: Mouton, 1959), p.94.
[3]Ibid., p.100.
[4]Ibid., p.96.
[5]Ibid., p.99.

'Indeed a devil has seduced you . . .'"[6] Assertion, persuasion, questioning of reality and conclusion are the four basic types of full Perfect as seen by van Schooneveld.[7] He is hesitant to apply these categories to the elliptic Perfect as he explains they occur in the elliptic Perfect "only in a weakened form."[8] He describes the elliptic Perfect as having a more general, timeless import.[9] He also claims that the elliptic Perfect is formed only with the third person,[10] a claim that is contradicted in this source text by three of the twenty-three instances of the elliptic Perfect.

An important point to bear in mind is that the objectivity van Schooneveld sees the Perfect as bringing to an event involves viewing the event apart from its development in time: result rather than process.[11] Either objectivizing the event or taking the event out of context can be the deeper function of the Perfect, depending on the example.[12] In fact, a strong argument can be made that "objectivizing an action" and the "taking an action out of the context" seen by van Schooneveld both result from the Perfect's function of focussing on the result of an action and pushing into the background the event itself. Note that in this the Volynian half of the chronicle differs, as Hens'ors'kyj reports, in that there the Perfect does not express resultativity.[13] He attributes the difference neither to the different ages of the texts, nor to the influence of the living language, but rather to the different levels of grammatical skill of the two authors.

---

[6]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, p.97.
[7]Ibid., p.95.
[8]Ibid., p.108.
[9]Ibid., p.121.
[10]Ibid., p.119.
[11]Ibid., p.121.
[12]Ibid., p.94.
[13]A.I. Hens'ors'kyj, Značennia form mynuloho času v Halyc'ko-Volyns'komu Litopysu (Kiev: Akademija nauk ukraïns'koï R.S.R., 1957), p.62.

Reported Events

The focus on the resulting state of a previous action makes the Perfect a natural choice for reporting prior events in either direct or indirect quotation: in the midst of a series of plot line events which are expressed using Aorists, an event is reported that took place in another setting, at another time. Since the event is over, its time indefinite, it is natural to focus on the the lasting result rather than the specifics of the event itself. For example, in the following example the Perfect is used to report the arrival of the Tatars in the midst of a passage detailing the activities of the Rusian princes:

> Пришедши же вьсти во станы, яко пришли суть видьть олядии рускыхъ, слышавъ же Даниилъ Романовичь и гна всьдъ на конь видьти невиданьноя рати . . . . (258)
>
> When the news came to camp, that they [the Tatars] had come to see the Rusian boats, Danilo Romanovič, having heard this, mounted his horse and rode off to see the unseen host . . . .

Note that the subordinate clause behaves like reported or indirect speech, in that the subordinate clause verb preserves the tense of the implied speech.[14] Therefore, the Perfect is used in Old East Slavic where the Pluperfect would be used in Modern English. This type of use of the Perfect, almost invariably a subordinate clause introduced by яко, is very common in the source text. Direct quotations in which the Perfect is used to report events may be introduced by речи 'to say', глаголати 'to say, to speak', or слышати яко 'to hear that . . . '. Reported events in narrative text may be introduced by увьдати яко 'to find out that . . . ', пришли вести

[14]See A.P. Vlasto, A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), pp.203-204.

яко 'news came that . . . ', бысть вьдомо яко 'became known that . . . ', and others. The Perfect is always preferred to the Aorist for the expression of reported events throughout the source text.

Negated Events

Just as we saw negated Pluperfects used to indicate absence of action in the past (see Chapter Six), the Perfect performs this function as well: the former within past tense narrative, the latter in quotations. In the following passage, the first and third Perfects indicate a lack of action before the present moment, the second indicates the accomplishment of the same action at the present moment, and the fourth indicates a lack of action (more precisely, its desired result) at any time in the past.

> Рекшу ему: "Данило, чему еси давно не пришелъ? А нынъ оже еси пришел — а то добро же. Пьеши ли черное молоко, наше питье, кобылий кумузъ?" Оному же рекшу: "Доселъ есмь не пилъ. Нынъ же ты велишь — пью." Он же рче: "Ты уже нашь же тотаринъ. Пий наше питье.". . . И присла вина чюмъ и рече: "Не обыкли пити молока, пий вино." (314)
>
> He [Batyj] said to him: "Danilo, why haven't you come before? But now you have come — this is good. Do you drink black milk, our drink, mare's milk?" He [Danilo] then answered: "I haven't drunk it before now. Now, as you ask me to, I will drink it." He said: "You are already one of us, a Tatar. Drink our drink.". . . And [Batyj] sent him a ladle of wine, and said "You are not used to (have not become used to) drinking milk — drink wine."

There are, however, two cases of negated Perfects in past tense narrative text. The first example shows a rather abrupt turn from a series of events in the past to consideration of a condition supposedly relevant at the present moment:

Василка же Юрьи попъ с кормилицею возмя, изыиде дырею градною, не вьдяху бо, камо бьжаще, бъ бо Романъ убьенъ на ляхохъ, а Лестько мира не створилъ (238)

The priest Jurij and the nurse took Vasilko away, leaving through a hole in the city wall, but they did not know whither to flee, for Roman was killed at war with Poland, and Lestko had not made peace.

This Perfect clearly looks to be an "elliptic Pluperfect." The other case of a negated Perfect in past tense narrative is similar. Similar examples are cited by van Schooneveld, both negated and positive.[15] In fact, Hens'ors'kyj identifies five elliptic Pluperfects in our source text.[16] These make up half the Perfects which were neither direct nor indirect speech. Perhaps the implication here is that in such examples the difference between the Perfect and the Pluperfect is unimportant. This idea is better exemplified by the second example in our source text: "Бысть побьда на вси князи рускыя. Тако же не бывало никогда же." (260) 'All the Rusian princes were defeated. Such a thing has (had) never happened (before).' It may be that the author wants to circumvent any perception that such an event could have taken place later on, a perception which the Pluperfect does not discourage. Thus the negation is somehow timeless, the event either never occurring (first example) or never occurring outside of that point in the time line.

Narration vs. Quotation

E.N. Prokopovič suggests that in Old Russian chronicles the Perfect is found primarily in direct quotations:[17] in our chronicle just over half the

[15]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, p.118.
[16]Hens'ors'kyj, Značennja form mynuloho času v Halyc'ko-Volyns'komu Litopysu, p.70.
[17]E. N. Prokopovič, "Glagol'noe skazuemoe," Istoričeskaia grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), p.52.

Perfects (thirty-three out of fifty-nine) are in direct quotations. Of the remaining twenty-six instances, fifteen are implied or explicit indirect speech, making 81% of all instances of the Perfect direct or indirect speech. Much is made of the distinction between chronicle narrative discourse in general, which is said to be more archaic than the living language of the time,[18] and quotations, which may be expected to be less archaic. In view of this it is interesting to note that Perfects and Aorists occur with roughly equal frequency in quotations in our source text. (This proportion may be contrasted to the proportion reported for preterites in legal documents (грамоты): 85.8 percent Perfects vs. 13.3 percent Aorists).[19] Pluperfects, past active short Participles and Imperfects occur less often than either of these, the most common verbal forms in quotations in the source text being Imperatives and Presents. The proportion of Aorists to Perfects in the balance of the text is roughly sixty to one, where Presents and Imperatives are virtually non-existent. Thus a marked difference is noted between quotations and narrative, yet it is also clear that the Aorist does play a role in the former.

Aorist versus Perfect

In our source text the Perfect is indeed, as van Schooneveld claims, used for making an assertion, both the full and elliptic Perfect functioning in this way. The following example is an assertion, although for rhetorical purposes it takes the form of a question with an element of sarcasm, thus appearing to be an act of persuasion. Nevertheless, the information is in

---

[18]L.E. Lopatina,"Vtorostepennoe skazuemoe," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), p.105.

[19]V.I. Borkovskij, Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot (prostoe predloženie) (L'vov: L'vovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, 1949), p.157.

truth known to both speaker and addressee, and therefore should be considered an assertion: "Не вьсте ли, яко на мужи на ратныь нашли есте, а не на жены?" (326) 'Don't you know that you have engaged men and soldiers, not women?' In another example, the listener is reminded of a generally known, obvious, objective fact: "И похвали Бурандай Василка, 'аще братъ твой не ьхалъ.'" (348) 'And Burandaj praised Vasilko, "although your brother did not come."'

The difficulty is that the Aorist is also used in quotations to make assertions. For an admission of guilt the Aorist is always used:

> Присла бо Михаилъ слы Данилу и Василку, река: 'Многократы согрьшихо вам и многократы пакости творях ти. Что ти обьщахъ[20] и того не створих.' (294)
>
> Mixail sent messengers to Danilo and Vasilko, saying "I have sinned against you many times and many times caused you harm. I did not do what I promised you."

It would appear that an accusation, another type of assertion, can be expressed by either an Aorist or a Perfect. In this passage, Danilo accuses his steward, who defends himself by accusing someone else: "Данилу же королеви рекшу ему: 'Зль створилъ еси.' Дворьскому же отвьщавшу: 'Не язъ, не хотьние мое, злое ны створилъ посолъ, не изнесъ слова права намъ.'" (336) 'And Prince Danilo said to him: "You have acted badly." The steward answered: "Not I, not my wish, but the messenger caused us harm, not having brought us your message correctly."' On the other hand, the Aorist is used in the following: "'Сыну, сгрьшихъ не давъ тобь Галича, но давъ

---

[20] I count this form as an Aorist purely by virtue of its association with the clearly Aorist "створих." From its form alone, it could just as easily be a contracted Imperfect.

иноплеменьнику. Судислава льстьця свьтомъ, обольсти бо мя.'" (266) 'Son, I have sinned in not giving you Halyč, but giving it to a foreigner, on the false advice of Sudislav, for he deceived me.' A further example is: "Курилъ же отвъща ему: 'Се ли твори возмездье уема своима воз добродьанье!'" (300) 'Kuril answered him: "You made this recompense to your uncles for their kindness!?"'

A desire to sequence events in a quotation may be fulfilled by using Aorists instead of Perfects. In this passage, Kuril recounts a sequence of events, making assertions which themselves form a narrative text:

> Не помниши ли ся, яко король угорьскый изгналъ тя бъ и земль сь отцьмь ти? Како тя восприаста огосподина моя, уя твоя, отча ти во величи чести держаста, и Киевъ обьчаста тобь, Луческъ вдаста, и матерь твою и сестру свою изъ Ярославлю руку изъяста и отчю ти вдаста. (300)
>
> Don't you remember how the Hungarian king had banished you and your father from this land? And how my lords, your uncles, took your father in, showed him great esteem, promised you Kiev, gave you Luck and took your mother, their sister, from Jaroslav's hands and returned her to your father?

By its nature the Perfect focuses on the current relevance of the result-state brought about by the event, rather than the actor or the event itself. Focus on the latter can motivate the Aorist in speech:

> Не сии ли избиша отци ваши и братью вашю? А иньи имьние ваше разграбиша, и дщери ваша даша за рабы ваша! А отчьствии вашими владьша инии пришелци! (244)
>
> Weren't these the ones who slaughtered your fathers and brothers, while others plundered your wealth and gave your daughters in marriage to your slaves, while strangers ruled your patrimony?

This same specific focus on a past event probably motivates the choice of an Aorist in the following example which refers to a previously mentioned event: "Язъ вамъ не рьхъ ли, яко не подобить изяти труднымъ воемь противу цѣлымъ?" (284) 'Didn't I tell you that tired soldiers should not be sent against fresh ones?'

On occasion the Aorist and Perfect complement each other in quotations: the Perfect referring to a state, the Aorist referring to the cause. For example, here Boleslav questions the state of the Boloxovian princes being in his territory, denying what might have been a cause: "Рекшу Болеславу: 'Почто суть вошли во землю мою, яко не вдах[21] имъ,' . . ." (300-2) 'Boleslav said: 'Why have they entered my land, as I did not give them permission?'" Another possibility is that the fact of their entry without permission precludes the Perfect as a relevant possible form: the suggestion that permission might in the immediate future be granted, implied by a Perfect, is irrelevant now that the princes are here. Thus we are concerned only with the point at which permission might have been given, a point in the past — and so the Aorist is used rather than the Perfect. Either way, focus is on the event, or rather non-event.

Similarly, Danilo asserts his claim of authority over a city, then relates the event from which this authority stems:

> Оному рекшу, яко: 'Се былъ градъ нашь, и отець наших, вы же не изволисте внити вонь.'. . . И обьновивы и созда церковь прекрасну святое Богородици, и рече: 'Се градъ мой, преже бо прияхъ и копьемь.' (298)

[21] The Pamjatniki edition has "влах", obviously a misprint; the Polnoe sobranie has "вдах."

> He said "This was (has been) our city, and our fathers', and yet you don't allow me to enter it.". . . Danilo, having renovated the city, built a beautiful church dedicated to the Mother of God, and said: "This is my city, for long ago I took it by the spear."

The use of the adverbial "преже," 'before', precludes a focus on the result, which in any event is already expressed by "былъ" and by the omitted copula in the phrase "Се градъ мой."

Note that the examples of Aorists cited in the preceding paragraphs could easily have been assertions of objectivized events, expressed by the Perfect. They are not, however, and the reasons have more to do with the traditional event vs. resulting state dichotomy traditional in studies of the Perfect vs. non-Perfect preterites.

Drawing a conclusion can also be accomplished by an Aorist rather than a Perfect: "Неверныимъ Молибоговидьчьмь узрьвши се, страхъ имъ бысть от бога, рекъшимъ, яко: 'Свьтъ нашь раздрушися.'" (276) 'When the unfaithful Molibogovičes saw this, they became fearful of God, saying: "Our plot is destroyed."' An example where the Perfect is used: "Сгадавше Данило и Болеславъ, яко: 'Всю землю полпьнилъ есмы.'" (330) 'Danilo and Boleslav decided: "We have already ravaged the entire land."' Thus assertions, accusations, and conclusions can all be expressed by either a Perfect or an Aorist. A need to focus on the event rather than any resulting state or to sequence events will motivate the use of the Aorist.

Elliptic versus full Perfect

The Perfect occurs in the source text in both its variants: the full Perfect (in which the auxiliary verb is present) and the elliptic Perfect (the l-participle

alone). Various authors have suggested that the presence of the auxiliary permitted the omission of the subject, while the loss of the auxiliary was accompanied by the restoration of the subject, either a noun or a pronoun.[22] In our source text, however, the elliptic forms have no subject in ten of the twenty three instances, despite the lack of a marker for the subject. Similarly, in twenty-two of the thirty-six instances of the full Perfect there is a subject present despite the presence of a subject marker on the auxiliary verb.

The suggestion has been made that the Perfect in its basic meaning of a state resulting from a prior action is consistently used in the full form.[23] In our source text no strict division between the full and elliptic Perfects has been noted. Both are used in the text for reporting events, drawing conclusions, making assertions, in main and subordinate clauses, under negation, and with verbs of both aspects. For example, Danilo sees the results of two prior actions within the same episode, in one case the full Perfect is used, in the other, the elliptic Perfect:

> Потом же Данилъ, видивъ люди своя, яко <u>испилися</u>, не хоть стати въ города, но иде на ину страну Диѣстра. . Гнавъ же Данилъ ко мосту и узрѣвъ, яко коньчь мосту <u>угаслъ есть</u>, и бысть радость велика. (272)
>
> Then Danilo, having seen that his people <u>were drunk</u>, did not want to make camp near the city, but went to the other side of the Dniester. . . . Danilo, having ridden up to the bridge, saw that the end of the bridge <u>had stopped burning</u>, and there was great rejoicing.

---

[22]See for exampleV.V. Ivanov, "Istorija vremennyx form glagola," <u>Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka</u> (Moskva: Nauka, 1982), p.94, p.100.

[23]Moshe Taube, "On the penetration of the Perfect into the Russian narrative system," <u>Russian Linguistics</u> 5:2 (Dec., 1980), p.122. For the opposite view, see Ivanov, "Istorija vremennyx form glagola," p.102.

In the following passage the identity of the agent of the same action is at question: the action is expressed once with the full Perfect, once with the elliptic Perfect: "Данилу же королеви рекшу ему: 'Зль створилъ еси.' Дворьскому же отвьщавшу: 'Не язь, не хотьние мое, злое ны створилъ посолъ, не изнесъ слова права намъ.'" (336) 'And Prince Danilo said to him: "You have acted badly." The steward answered: "Not I, not my wish, but the messenger caused us harm, not having brought us your message correctly."'

Hens'ors'kyj, who links the use of the auxiliary in the Perfect of 3sg verbs in direct quotations to a resultative meaning,[24] cites an example of an elliptic Perfect in such an environment as not having resultative meaning — the sole such example, according to him.[25] Nevertheless, I have identified three additional cases (with выгнати 'to banish', остати 'to remain', and створити 'to do, to make'), each with resultative meaning. An example: "Свьтъ створи со ятровью своею и с бояры володимерьскыми, рече: 'Володиславъ княжится, а ятровь мою выгналъ.'" (246) '[The king] held a council with his sister-in-law and the boyars of Volodimer, and said: "Volodislav rules and has banished my sister-in-law."'

The suggestions made by van Schooneveld of what the elliptic Perfect cannot do (make assertions, draw conclusions, occur with the first or second persons)[26] are not supported by this source text. His conclusions about the

---

[24]Hens'ors'kyj, Značennja form mynuloho času v Halyc'ko-Volyns'komu Litopysu, p.54.
[25]Ibid., p.54.
[26]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, p.119. Three examples in our source text contradict the last claim, including the last phrase of the passage from p.314 cited above under "Negated Events."

elliptic Perfect of a positive nature include emphasis of the contrast of the expressed result of of a prior action to the situation in which the addressee already finds himself — when the elliptic Perfect occurs in main clauses. When the elliptic Perfect occurs in relative clauses, then a general anteriority without emphasis of a contrast to the situation is indicated.[27] He explains that this difference stems from the difference between the nature of a relative clause and that of a main clause, and the relative clauses in the source text are consistent with his theory.

However, many instances of the elliptic Perfect in main clauses lack the suggestion of contrast between the resulting state and the situation of the addressee, as in the following passage: "Свьтъ створи со ятровью своею и с бояры володимерьскыми, рече: 'Володиславъ княжится, а ятровь мою выгналъ.'" (246) 'The king held a council with his sister-in-law and the boyars of Volodimer, and said: 'Volodislav rules and has expelled my sister-in-law."' The situation referred to is not new, but established. Similarly, there is no such contrast in: "Оньм же рекшимъ, яко: 'То есть мирникъ нашь, братъ его, воевалъ с нами. Туда идемь.'" (348) 'They said: "He is our ally, his brother fought with us. Let us go there."' So there is no dichotomy of use between the full and elliptic Perfects: both are used for reporting events, drawing conclusions, making assertions, with resultative meaning, with all persons and numbers, in main and subordinate clauses, under negation, and with imperfective and perfective verbs. The two forms are used in parallel instances for no obvious reason.

---

[27]van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System, pp.119-120.

Aspect

The distinction of aspect appears to function only on the lexical level and does not affect the function of the Perfect on other discourse levels, in contrast to the modern system. There are ten examples of imperfective Perfects among the fifty-nine instances of the Perfect in the fifty-seven page source text. These include non-goal oriented actions (пити 'to drink'), contexts where the action itself is the only focus (кланятися 'to swear', княжити 'to reign, to rule', платити 'to pay'), focus on the sum of experience gained from repeated or durative actions (ходити 'to go, to walk', быти 'to be', воевати 'to wage war', стояти 'to stand'), and categorical negation (не бывати 'not to be' - habitual). As we may expect, most instances of the Perfect are perfective verbs, as the resulting state often requires the accomplishment of the most basic goal of an action. Note, however, that the percentage of Perfects which are imperfective (17 percent) is higher than the corresponding figure for Aorists (6 percent) and also the share of Imperfects which are perfective (3.5 percent): focus on the result rather than the action itself liberates the semantics to a certain extent from any tie to completiveness or telicity.

Foregrounding and Backgrounding

From the foregoing it seems clear that the Perfect takes an event out of the surrounding context, focussing on its result rather than the action itself. In terms of foregrounding and backgrounding, we find that the Perfect refers our attention to an event away from the current moment in the plot line only in order to bring our attention to a state relevant at the current point in the

plot. The state may of course be relevant for a greater or lesser period of time. It provides background for the main plot line events.

The whole notion of the plot line is obscured when examining that part of a narrative text consisting of quotations, which is where the majority of the instances of the Perfect in the source text was found. Sometimes the verb phrases add information to the plot of the narrative; in other cases, they repeat information or confirm what the reader may already have assumed. In all instances the information supplements the principal events of the plot.

Outside of quotations, the Perfect is more likely to present new information, although it may simply bring back into current relevance previously imparted information. In cases where information, of which the reader may or may not have been aware, is reported, the point is that the recipient of the news became aware at that point. For example, in the passage from page 258 cited above under Reported Events, the arrival of the Tatars provokes a response only when the news of their arrival reaches the Rusian camp. The significance of the Perfect for the plot line is that it indicates not that the event took place at point A, but that the resulting state became relevant at point B. Point B can be the point at which an actor in the story became aware of the event. Point B may also be the point at which simply the reader is provided with background to plot line events.

Conclusions

The surveyed material demonstrates the use of the Perfect in focussing on the result of an action. It is this focus on result which explains the two functions noted by van Schooneveld, "objectivising" the event and removing it from the surrounding context. It is used for reported events, its negated

form indicates absence of action at any time in the past, and it is used in quotations alongside the Aorist when the event itself is not the central focus, or when there is a need to sequence events. We have seen that the Perfect can be used in quotations to express a result of an action which itself is then expressed by an Aorist. This suggests the contrast *result vs. action itself* — "objectivising" or "taking out of context" are not satisfactory explanations for this type of parallel occurrence of the Aorist and Perfect. Ultimately, resultativity carries the greater explanatory power. The Aorist is preferred for confessions of guilt, while accusations may be expressed by either tense, as is the case with conclusions. Focus on event or result is the motivating factor. The elliptic and full Perfects appear to have the same domain, and aspect does not affect the functioning of the Perfect on the level of foregrounding. In its concentration of the result of an action which took place in another setting, the Perfect serves to provide background for main plot line events. This background is distinguished from the type of background conveyed by the participles by its resultativity or by its less restricted use.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE PARTICIPLES AND DATIVE ABSOLUTES

Introduction

The various types of active participle are well represented in the twenty page source text, with the exception of the so called "invariant participle," predecessor of the modern деепричастие, which virtually does not occur at all in this late thirteenth century text. Participles have traditionally been described in the literature as secondary predicates, and the current investigation of their use confirms this description. It will be shown that, in relation to foreground events, past active participles express actions which are prior while present active participles present actions which are simultaneous. When these participles occur in the Dative Absolute construction, they sometimes also express a temporal or motivational meaning — in other cases, their meaning is indistinguishable from that of non-Dative participles. Dative Absolutes are occasionally used to express foreground events in this source text, and this presents something of an unsolved mystery. Non-Dative present active participles may also express

deeper background information. Otherwise, active participles express background events.

It must be pointed out that our terminology is defective. In accordance with every work I have come across on Old East Slavic or Old Church Slavic, I refer to "participles" while at the same time I demonstrate that the vast majority are not used participially. Participles in Modern Russian are indeed participial, i.e. verbal adjectives, and sometimes they become substantives. Old East Slavic participles were frequently, and overwhelminly so in this source text, used adverbially as secondary predicates, like the modern деепричастие or verbal adverb.

Past Active Participle: Form

In the twenty page source text, one hundred past active participles (PAPs) are found outside of Dative Absolutes. In addition there are some forms with confused agreement: one instance of a Dative subject никому 'no one (Dative)' plus a feminine (Dative/Nominative) participle instead of the expected masculine Dative. In one instance a Dative participle is combined with a Nominative subject. There are a few cases of a Nominative subject plus an "invariant participle" (either lacking the -ш- suffix or using the Nominative feminine singular where something else was required), but these are attested only in the Hypatian manuscript. There are an additional 154 PAPs in Dative Absolute constructions.

The short forms are exclusively in the Nominative case, and are highly adverbial in the ideas expressed. (That is to say that they are more verbal and less nominal.) There are seven long forms, including substantivized forms, such as "о бывшихъ" 'about what had been', "до оставшихъ"

'to the last man', and the following example, "случившихся": "Мы же на преднее возвратимся, случившихся в Галичь." (240) 'We shall return then to the earlier [story of] 'that which took place' in Halyč.' Other long forms are highly adjectival: "бывшимъ" 'who were', and the following: "Я самому Данилу бодену бывшю в перси, младъества ради и буести не чюяше ранъ бывшихъ на телеси его." (260) 'While Danilo himself was wounded in the chest, he did not feel the wounds [which were] on his body because of his youth and bravery.' Also found are "изнемогошеи" ('having become exhausted'), not supported by all manuscripts, and "угонивы и" ('having caught up') which is probably a long form but is otherwise inexplicable. Aspect will be discussed below in the section on Dative Absolutes.

Past Active Participle: Meaning

Past active participles express events which are secondary to foregrounded events and relate to them in a variety of ways: they can set the scene for foregrounded events, explain them, motivate them, give a precondition for them, or elaborate on them. For example, when Danilo rides off to see the hitherto unknown Tatar hordes:

> Пришедши же вѣсти во станы, яко пришли суть видѣть олядии рускыхъ, слышавъ же Данилъ Романовичь и гна всѣдъ на конь видѣти невиданьноя рати, и сущии с ними коньници и инии мнозии князи с нимь гнаша видити невидѣное рати. (258)
>
> When the news came to camp, that [the Tatars] had come to see the Rusian boats, Danilo Romanovič, having heard this, mounted his horse and rode off to see the unseen host, and cavalrymen [being] with them, and the many other princes with him rode off to see the unseen host.

it is first explained that he had heard the news of their arrival — an unimportant detail, as it is already clearly indicated what his purpose in riding away was.

A PAP is used in the following passage to elaborate on a single event: "Володислава же оковавше, ведоша и во Угры." (246) 'Having put Volodislav in chains, they led him off to Hungary.' Note the stative meaning implied by the participle: both the event itself and the resulting state, Volodislav being in chains, are expressed. The PAP can express a state resulting from a prior action. The action itself is clearly in the immediate past. If the event were more removed, a perfect tense would be used instead of a PAP. Compare for example: "Князъ же Данилови будущу во Угровьсцѣ, прислаша галичанѣ, рекуще, яко: 'Судиславъ шелъ есть во Понизье, а королевичь в Галичи осталъ, а поиди борже.'" (272) 'While Prince Danilo was in Ugrovesk, the Galicians sent word, saying "Sudislav has gone to Poniz'e, while the king's son has remained in Halyč; come quickly!"', in which the time of the events is not defined by the Perfect verbs, with the following passage: "Наутрее же Данилъ и Василко поемь вое свое и поидоста ко граду." (270) 'The next day Danilo and Vasilko, having taken their troops, marched toward the city.' In the latter the events are linked in clear temporal succession by the participle. Note that the subject of a participle is usually the subject of the preceding or immediately following action, which is not the case for most Perfects.

The PAP can also express a kind of precondition for a foregrounded action. In the following sentence: "Нынѣ же идемь и вземше[1] предаевь имъ отчьство ихъ." (238) 'Let us go now and, having seized their patrimony, return it to them.' an obvious precondition (as neither speaker nor addressee now has possession of the land in question) is named.

Present Active Participle: Form

In the twenty page source text, seventy Present Active Participles (PRAPs) occur outside of Dative Absolutes, where we find an additional eighty-three. In addition to these, there are four confused forms: these involve substitution of feminine for masculine, Nominative dual for Dative dual, and combinations of disagreement in case/gender/number, with different incorrect forms in the different manuscripts.

The sixty-two short forms are overwhelmingly Nominative, and have highly verbal meanings. There are only two short forms in oblique cases. The first is "мыющася", in a context which today would likely be expressed by a relative clause with a tensed form, or possibly an (adjectival) participle:[2] "Яндрѣй же и король увѣдивъ безаконье галичкое и мятежь, и посла Бенедикта со воими, и я Романа в бани мыющася и посла и во Угры." (240) 'King Andrej, having learned of the disorder and rebellion in Halyč, sent Benedict with soldiers, and captured Roman bathing in a bath house, and sent him to Hungary.' The other is "ездяща": "Данилъ бо младъ бѣ, и видѣвъ Гльба

[1]The Hypatian manuscript has incorrect "вземша."
[2]In discussing modern Russian I use the term "participle" to translate "причастие", never to translate "деепричастие."

Зеремиевича и Семьюна Кодьниньского мужескы ѣздяща, и приѣха к нима, укрѣпляя и." (252) 'Danilo was young, and so, having seen Gleb Zeremejevič and Semjun Kodninsky valiantly riding off to fight, he rode up to them, reinforcing them.' This is probably Nominative/Accusative dual for Genitive (Accusative animate) dual, in a clause which would today be an objective clause with a finite verb.

There are eight instances of long forms: рекый 'saying' occurs four times — there are many more instances of the short form реκы and also река, the East Slavic variant. Живущаго 'living person' occurs as a substantivized form, and стоящих 'who were standing' as a highly adjectival form, which would today be a participle. Сущии 'being' is used similarly, and in a context which suggests also the meaning of the definite article. Finally, видящие 'seeing' (incorrect видящи in the Hypatian Codex) occurs without any apparent motivation for the long form.

Present Active Participle: Meaning

The PRAP expresses an action which occurs simultaneously to some other action but is of less importance for the plot. In one respect its function is similar to that of the PAP: the latter expresses the influence of a previous action, this participle expresses the influence of an ongoing action. In both cases the actions are secondary to the plot. Frequently met in this form are the verbs which express the thought behind an action: хотьти 'to want', мньти 'to be of the opninion', and творити ся 'to be accomplished'. The highly stative имети 'to have' and быти 'to be' are also very common, as are рещи 'to say' — perfective, and глаголати 'to say, to speak' —

imperfective, in the expressions "посла . . . рекы", "посла . . . глаголюще" 'sent [messengers], saying'.

Like the Imperfect, the PRAP can express "deep" background information: information resulting from events or states which are highly independent of the plot line events. Thus so in the following passage, in which we are provided with information about one of the characters: "Бь бо Тимофьй в Галичь премудръ книжникъ, отчество имья во градь Кыевь." (240) 'There was in Halyč a wise scribe, Timofej, having a Kievan family.' Again like the Imperfect, it can supplement an event expresssed by other verbs: "Бь бо томитель бояромъ и гражаномъ. И блудъ творя и оскверняху жены же и черници и попадьи. (242) 'For he was a tormentor of boyars and townsfolk. Committing fornication, they defiled women, even nuns and priests' wives.'

Like the PAP, it can motivate a main event: in the following passage we are given a glimpse of Princess Anna's political strategy:

> Мати же вземьши мечь из руку, умоливші[3] его, остави в Галичи, а сама иде в Белзъ, оставивши и у невеьрных галичанъ, Володиславлимъ свьтомъ — хотяща бо княжити сама. (246)
>
> His mother took the sword from his hand, and, having convinced him, left him in Halyč, while she herself went to Belz, having left him with the disloyal Galicians on Volodislav's advice — wanting herself to rule.

The event expressed by a PRAP is by nature secondary to the main plot line events it is simultaneous to. The choice of which event is to be expressed by a foregrounding form and which is to be expressed by a secondary form is,

---

[3]The Hypatian has incorrect "умоливше."

naturally, a subjective evaluation: "Он же, обуимая нозь его, обѣщася работь быти ему." (256) 'The other, embracing his legs, promised to be his slave.'

Dative Absolute: Form

In just twenty pages of source text, we find no less than 237 Dative Absolute constructions, or about one every fourth line: 154 of these are PAPs, 83 are PRAPs. Thus the majority of both past and present active participles occur in DAs. There are seventy-six long form participles among these, thirty-seven PAPs and thirty-nine PRAPs. Unlike the non-Dative participles, however, the usage of long vs. short form participle apparently depends on number of the subject alone: singular subjects require the short form, dual and plural subjects, the long form.[4] The Hypatian manuscript has a very few examples of short form dual and plural participles which are replaced by long forms in the other manuscripts. It is interesting to note that A.N. Sabenina[5] reports that the frequency of the long form DAs rose beginning in the fifteenth century as the occurrence of agreement of participles with their subjects declined.

Dative Absolute: Meaning

What has been said above about non-Dative participles can be applied to DAs as well. Of the known meanings specific to the Dative Absolute construction, the DA of time is the best represented in the source text:

---

[4]A.M. Sabenina,"Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj," Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), p.419, points out that the long forms are used in Old Russian DAs, but not in OCS.
[5]Ibid., p.419.

Пришедши же вѣсти во станы, яко пришли суть видѣть олядии рускыхъ, слышавъ же Данилъ Романовичь и гна всѣдъ на конь видѣти невиданьноя рати, и сущии с ними коньници и инии мнозии князи с нимь гнаша видити невидьное рати. Онемъ же отшедшимъ, Юрьги же имъ сказываше, яко: „Стрѣлци суть." (258)

When the news came to camp, that the Tatars had come to see the Rusian boats, Danilo Romanovič, having heard this, mounted his horse and rode off to see the unseen host, and cavalrymen being with him, and many other princes with him, they rode off to see the unseen host. When they had withdrawn, Jurij said to them: "They are archers."

The demise of the DA has been linked to the development of a healthy system of subordinate clauses, and indeed, this type of DA would be expressed in the modern language by a subordinate clause of time. Occasionally the DA of reason is found: "Мьстиславу же не стерпьвшю, и возвратися в Галичь." (260) 'Mstislav, not having been able to resist, returned to Halyč.' It should be mentioned that the DA of reason may simply be a metaphoric extension of the meaning of the DA of time.

The majority of DAs cannot be identified as expressing one of the traditional meanings of the DA, i.e. time, reason, condition, etc.[6] There may be, however, other ways of explaining DAs. For example, two noticeable trends may provide some clue as to their function. Firstly, DAs are consistently used when the requisite subject is a non-human, thus for example: "времени минувшу" 'time having passed, when time had passed', "мятежю воставшю" 'a rebellion having arisen'. As a rule non-

[6]These are the only three mentioned by Dibrov and Ovčinnikova (A.A. Dibrov and V.S. Ovčinnikova, Očerki drevnerusskogo jazyka (Rostov-na-Donu: Rostovskij universitet, 1965), p. 109-110) in connection with Old Russian. The others are: objective, concessive, attributive, consequential, and comparative, similar to categories of subordinate clauses in general.

human subjects, which appear infrequently in the story, appear in DAs. Secondly, a DA is frequently used when the subject is different from the preceding subject of a tensed verb: where the subject was absent from the preceding clause, present in the preceding clause but in an oblique case, or, sometimes, a repeat of the subject of the immediately preceding DA. Somehow the DA may be used to signal a subject different from that expected, just as the Perfect may replace a PAP if the subject is diferent from the main clause verb. (See above under Past Active Participle: Meaning.) Lunt, writing about OCS, says that "normally the dative participle does not refer to the same person or thing as the subject of the main verb, but this rule is occasionally violated."[7] Sabenina merely suggests that the subject was different more often than not.[8] For example, in the following passage, there are five different subjects, all expressed in DAs (I have highlighted each DA differently here for identification):

> Татаром же бѣгающимъ, Данилови же избивающи ихъ своимъ полкомъ, и Олгови Курьскому крѣпко бившимся **инѣмъ полкомъ сразившимся** с ними. Грѣхъ ради нашихъ, *рускимъ полкомъ побьженымъ бывшимъ*. (260)

> The Tatars fled, while Danilo slew them with his regiment, and Oleg of Kursk fought valiantly. **Other regiments engaged** them. For our sins, *the Rusian regiments were defeated.*

Nevertheless, in twelve percent of the instances in this source text, the DA repeats the preceding Nominative subject. If we are to suggest a change of subject as being a general rule, then we must admit an intolerably high number of exceptions.

---

[7]Horace G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p.132.
[8]Sabenina,"Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj," p.419.

Thus the distinction between the DA and the Nominative participles is unclear. The change of topic from the preceding clause has been identified in the literature, but there are too many counterexamples to suggest it as the whole explanation. The use of a specialized DA such as the DA of time distinguishes it from non-Dative participles, but most DAs are not used in one of these specific meanings. Inanimacy appears to play a role, but there are large numbers of animate DAs as well. The DA requires the overt presence of the subject, but many non-Dative participles have an overt subject.

So the use of the Dative Absolute obviously requires deeper study in order to distinguish it from the other participles more consistently. Another complicating factor is the use of "и" (as the coordinating conjunction 'and') with participles. Both Dative and non-Dative participles occur in clauses linked to other clauses by "и" where "и" is clearly a conjunction and not a pronoun. (See for example the passage from page 270 cited under Past Active Participle: Meaning above.) The use of what is supposed to be a secondary predicate in what appears to be a coordinate clause is a conundrum which certainly requires further investigation, unfortunately, beyond the scope of the present work. References can be found in the literature to the lack of a clear division between coordination and subordination of clauses,[9] and A.A. Dibrov and V.S. Ovčinnikova even refer to the use of coordinate conjunctions to link a subordinate to a main clause.[10] At this point it should be repeated that the DA declined when a stronger system of subordination developed.

---

[9]N.G. Samsonov, Drevnerusskij jazyk (Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973), pp.205-206.
[10]Dibrov and Ovčinnikova, Očerki drevnerusskogo jazyka , p.110.

It is clear that the DA can express sequenced events, as in the following and other passages:

> Сѣдяшим же имъ в думѣ и хотящимъ огнемь зажещи, милостивому богу вложиващю во сердце Василько изиити вонъ, и обнажившу мѣчь свой играя на слугу королева, иному похвативши щитъ играющи. Неверным Молибоговидьчьмь узрѣвши се, страхъ имъ бысть от бога, рекъшимъ, яко: 'Свѣтъ нашь раздрушися.' И побѣгшимъ имъ, яко оканьны Святополкъ. (276)

> While they [Danilo and Vasilko] sat in council and they[the conspirators] wanted to set fire [to the building], the merciful Lord implanted in Vasilko an urge to leave, and he unsheathed a sword in jest against a servant of the king, while the other took up a shield in jest. When the unfaithful Molibogovičes saw this, they became fearful of God, saying: "Our plot is destroyed." And they fled, like the accursed Svjatopolk.

It is hard to imagine, after reading the preceding two passages, that the DA is a way of downgrading the importance of an event for the plot. The DA's appearance in relating foreground events is completely unexpected. Although we should remember that examples such as these form only a tiny percentage of the number of foreground events, it would appear that the DA's use for foregrounding shows that its overall use is neither consistent nor obvious. The evidence of the Hypatian Codex, in which there is a much higher incidence (though still relatively low) of "mixed constructions" (i.e., a Dative subject used with a Nominative participle) than in the other manuscripts, can be seen as evidence of the impending demise of this construction.

Aspectual Usage

The same trends in aspectual usage noted in the functioning of the Aorist are seen in the PAP, both within and outside of the Dative Absolute construction. That is, the PAP is usually perfective, as one would expect: the influence of a preceding action is more likely to be felt if that action is a goal oriented event presented in its totality. Yet imperfective events can occur as PAPs and Aorists if they are negated events associated with a point in the plot, or non-goal oriented yet plot advancing events. There are 22 imperfective PAPs of the total of 254.

Five of these express durative actions at a juncture: not goal oriented but too important for backgrounding: бити ся 'to fight', воевати 'to wage war', гнати 'to pursue'. There are four cases of negated PAPs: denial of juncture at a critical point in the plot: не смѣти 'not to dare', не мощи 'not to be able'.

Another seven are verbs of speech and perception. These include вещати 'to say, to promise', вѣдати 'to know', слышати 'to hear', and мнѣти 'to be of the opinion'. Other verbs in this semantic class are biaspectual, that is, not adhering consistently to either aspect. As J. Forsyth has pointed out, this class of verbs is rather indifferent to the distinction of aspect in the modern language.[11] Therefore I suggest that their categorization as imperfectives in dictionaries of Old East Slavic or Old Church Slavic need not disturb us when we see them appearing in a usually perfective grammatical form.

---

[11] J. Forsyth, A Grammar of Aspect: Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), p.96.

There are various explanations for the remaining six instances: repeated actions may be summarized by an imperfective PAP to express their cumulative effect, also juncture may occur when an action is merely engaged in, not brought to some kind of conclusion. Aspect, as previously stated, seems to function more on the lexical level than on the level of foregrounding and backgrounding.

In the case of the PRAP, only imperfective verbs are used, with the exception of three cases of the perfective PRAP возмя, 'taking', which occurs in the Hypatian manuscript only — in the other manuscripts the equivalent PAP, вземь, 'having taken', replaces it.

Foregrounding and Backgrounding

Judging from the evidence of the source text, we may be able to distinguish a third level of grounding: a level of background information without a direct link to the plot but of interest nonetheless, to supplement the other background level, the level of events which are supplementary to the significant plot line events. The former I refer to as "deep" background, the latter as background events.[12] As seen above, the PRAP can be used on both these levels. The PAP is found only on the level of background events. The use of the Dative Absolute construction appears to be primarily on the level of background events (indeed the Dative Absolutes of time and reason by their nature suggest this level), although some examples are found of what appear to be foreground events expressed by DAs. It must be admitted, however, that the use of the DA in place of a Nominative

[12]Cf. Larry B. Jones and Linda K. Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," Discourse Studies in Mesoamerican Languages, Vol. I (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1979), for whom these levels are respectively "background"and "ordinary events" (as opposed to "significant events", my foregrounding).

construction is in several passages somewhat mysterious, and the possibility exists that its use may be inconsistent in this chronicle, written in the Dative Absolute's twilight years.

Conclusions

The examination of the use of active participles in the source text has revealed the following similarities and contrasts: all participles are adverbial in meaning when in the Nominative case or in a Dative Absolute. They appear overwhelmingly in the short form, except: a) when they are highly adjectival or substantivized, and b) when, in a Dative Absolute, they are dual or plural in number. The past active participle expresses events secondary and prior to the main plot line events. Although the events are secondary, the participial clause may be linked to the main clause by what is described as a coordinating conjunction, "и". The present active participle expresses events secondary to and simultaneous with the main events, or events providing deeper background information about the participants in the story. It therefore functions on two levels of grounding, like the Imperfect tense. The mysterious Dative Absolute construction may (or, unfortunately, may not) express a meaning (in addition to that of the participle concerned) making the participial phrase equivalent to a subordinate clause of time or reason. Participles in a Dative Absolute usually function on the level of background events, although occasionally foreground events are expressed in an infrequently found long sequence of DAs.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSIONS

Our task was to analyse the function of specific grammatical forms on the plane of foregrounding and backgrounding in the Galician Chronicle. The analysis has yielded a general outline of the grounding functions of these forms and the way they interact with certain other meanings, such as perfect and perfective. We can now review these findings in the light of previous descriptions.

Functions of Verbal Forms in the GVC

Although no attempt to describe the grounding system of Old East Slavic has yet been attempted, certain conventional descriptions of the functions of the forms surveyed here are found in the literature.

The view of the Aorist as expressing a past action as a moment in time, put forward by, among others, Potebnja and Prokopovič, is generally supported by the finding of the Aorist as the foregrounding tool. The concept of the Aorist as unmarked preterite is advanced by van Schooneveld, who

sees the Perfect as expressing the "vividness" of past events. In elaborating, however, he describes the characteristics of the Aorist, the same characteristics which are useful for a foregrounding form: tendency to relate the action which is basic to the story and action which allows its effects to continue into the next situation. Samsonov adheres to an evolutionary view of the Aorist: its pre-thirteenth century meaning is close to that which is supported by Potebnja and Prokopovič; from the thirteenth century its meaning shifted to that described by van Schooneveld, i.e. unmarked past. The use of the Aorist in this thirteenth century source text clearly reflects the former meaning.

Some authors, notably van Schooneveld, Ivanov, Samsonov, and Lunt, describe the anomalous бъ-forms of быти as "imperfective Aorists," while others, including Schmalstieg and Vlasto, treat these as variant forms of the Imperfect. Many of the former group admit that their meaning is identical to that of the Imperfect. This study supports the view that the бъ-forms function in the same way as the Imperfect forms of быти.

In the case of the Pluperfect, although there is broad agreement about the basic meaning of the form (the denotation of an event which took place prior to other past tense events with which it collocates), Lunt and van Schooneveld specify distinct meanings for the Pluperfect with бъ-form auxiliary and the Pluperfect with Imperfect auxiliary. Although this description (in which the retrospection denoted by the Pluperfect is itself an event, with qualities of the tense used for the auxiliary) seems to apply to a large portion of the sample, the presence of some counterexamples and the lack of evidence for a parallel distinction among the simple preterites of быти cast doubt on the validity of the theory as it applies to this source text.

The absence of the бѣ-forms in either function from the Volynian half of the GVC suggests that this form may simply have been an archaism or Church Slavonicism used incorrectly in the Galician half.

The Perfect is widely described as denoting the result of a prior action. Alternatively, its ability to take an expressed event out of the surrounding context and to "objectivize" it are suggested as key attributes by van Schooneveld. However, the former description has more explanatory power in terms of the grounding system of the language, in that it more effectively distinguishes the use of the Perfect from the other backgrounding tools. The functions described by van Schooneveld can be seen as stemming from this basic meaning. In addition, his four basic uses of the Perfect (assertion, persuasion, questioning validity, and conclusion) are not exclusive to the Perfect — they can sometimes be expressed by the Aorist, the choice being motivated by the basic contrast Perfect→result: Aorist→event.

Prokopovič and others have suggested that the Perfect is primarily found in Old Russian chronicles in direct quotations: in our chronicle the majority of Perfects are in direct quotations, but the role of the Perfect outside quoted material, especially in events related by one character to another in the narrative, must not be ignored. Similarly, the primacy of the Perfect as the tense for quoted speech must not be exaggerated: the Perfect and the Aorist are equally frequent in the quoted material within this chronicle. Here again, result versus event is the motivating contrast.

The ellipsis of the Perfect's auxiliary verb has been linked to the redundancy of the construction: subject noun phrase + auxiliary verb with NP agreement + l-participle. Ivanov and others have suggested that when

the auxiliary was omitted, the subject was present, and vice versa. In this text, however, a majority of instances of the Perfect either have both auxiliary and subject, or lack both. Furthermore, Moshe Taube's suggestion that the full form Perfect is the consistent mode of expression of the Perfect's original resultative meaning has been found not to apply to the Galician Chronicle. No strict division in meaning between full and elliptic Perfect was found, although the latter occasionally appears to carry the meaning of the Pluperfect. (Without an auxiliary verb, there is nothing to distinguish an "elliptic Pluperfect" from an elliptic Perfect.) The elliptic Perfect can certainly be expected to show an expansion beyond the original perfect meaning, as it eventually evolved to become the all-purpose preterite, but the distinction suggested by Taube is not supported by the text. (Contrast the Volynian half of the chronicle, written not much later, where, Hens'ors'kyj reports, resultativity is not associated with the Perfect.) Hens'ors'kyj also denies categorically resultative meaning for elliptic Perfects in quotations in the Galician Chronicle itself, but in addition to his one cited counterexample, we have found three others. In addition, van Schooneveld suggests that the elliptic Perfect is not used for making assertions or drawing conclusions, nor does it occur with the first or second persons. These claims are not valid for this text, as shown by our counterexamples.

Coordination of "Secondary" Predicates

Another issue which can be addressed in connection with grounding is the system of subordination/coordination of clauses containing secondary predicates. The existence of participial predicates with an expressed subject, linked to a tensed verb-predicate without an expressed subject, by what has been assessed as a coordinating conjunction, calls into question

the analysis of the participle as a secondary predicate. It could be argued that the distinction of subordination versus coordination is irrelevant exactly because the choice of "primary" or "restricted" predicate form makes the relationship between the clauses clear. This explanation, however, seems rather circular.

The secondary nature of participial predicates is also suggested by their morphology. While tensed verbs show person and number agreement, participles behave like nouns and adjectives in that they show agreement for gender and number only. Furthermore, the ancestry of the modern деепричастие, a secondary predicate, leads us directly to the short participles.

This is not to suggest that the events which the participles convey are inherently secondary, or trivial. In a long narrative text, it seems intuitive that the use of a variety of forms, a mixture of tensed and participial forms, makes for livelier reading. The choice of participial versus tensed form must occasionally be highly subjective. Thus the realization of an event by a participle need not mean that the event is secondary in an absolute sense, only that the author's plan allows it to be seen this way. In other words, the author may decide which events are to appear on the levels of foreground and background events in order to manipulate our perception of his narrative, his version of reality.

Legitimacy of Grounding and Its Implications

An important question that presents itself is, "Is it appropriate to assume a grounding system in a seven hundred year old literary language?" Unlike other linguistic units, such as the phoneme, grounding need not necessarily

be considered basic to language. Furthermore, the language under examination here is in a state of flux. Some forms are going out of use, others are developing. The tense system is on the verge of being replaced by the aspectual system. Yet the evidence provides strong grounds for believing that a grounding system is in operation in Old East Slavic in this text. This particular text is a good candidate for such a test, because of the rich variety of forms it employs. The explanatory power of grounding and its consistency in functioning are, however, certainly open to dispute.

If it is legitimate to assume a grounding system, it may not be legitimate to assume that the choice of tense/participle can be explained in terms of grounding alone. Grounding coding may, in fact, be a metaphoric extension of the basic tense/aspectual meanings of the various forms. In other words, the grounding meanings of the forms may stem from their "conventional grammatical" meanings. The question then arises, "If these two dimensions are in conflict, which one determines the choice of form?" A similar problem in the modern language is exemplified by the use of the (non-completive) imperfective aspect for a completed action, the 'констатация факта действия.' It would most certainly be premature to begin explaining the verbal system on the basis of grounding alone. Understanding of the grounding system does, nevertheless, enhance our understanding of the various categories in that they are presented in another dimension.

In analyzing the use of the various forms, it has been convenient to group them on three levels: foregrounding, background events, and deep background. Only these three levels are apparent despite Jones and Jones' finding that a language with an extra background level should have an extra foreground level, as well as a peak level. A comparison of various single-

narrative documents would be more useful in finding a peak level. Similarly, the Dative Absolute construction, as well as a host of other possible grounding tools, could be examined for evidence of a second foregrounding level. The three level structure, however, is the one suggested by the forms surveyed in this particular text.

Foreground

Now let us turn to the specific forms as they function in the grounding system. The analysis of the Galician Chronicle presented in the preceding chapters has shown one form, the Aorist, to be the main foregrounding tool of Old East Slavic. Passive foreground events may be expressed by the Aorist ("perfective Aorist" to some scholars) of быти, 'to be', plus the appropriate past passive participle. The Aorist is by far the most common of the forms surveyed, a finding which is in keeping with its role as the foregrounding tool.

Background

There are a variety of backgrounding forms functioning on either or both of two levels. The higher level, the level of "background events" contains events and states which are temporally and spatially connected to the foreground, or main plot line events. These events or states are simultaneous with the main events, and usually amplify, give a precondition for, justify, or motivate the main events. They do not advance the plot — this role is exclusive to the level of foreground events — but they do enrich our understanding of the plot.

The lower of these two levels, the level of "deep background," lacks a temporal and spatial connection to the plot. Its purpose is to provide information which will increase our understanding of some part of the narrative — especially a character. The events it describes have no direct bearing on the plot, and the information it provides may increase our understanding of the context of a character, or the context of the narrative as a whole, but this information cannot be restricted in its amplificatory power to one main event, and in this it differs from the level of background events.

All the forms surveyed save the Aorist can operate on the level of background events; only the Imperfect (including both the бъ-forms and Imperfects of быти) and Present Active Participle function on the level of deep background. When the latter is used on this level it usually expands on an Imperfect with which it is associated. In fact, the participles, although they compete on the same levels as tensed forms, are more restricted in their use. For example, while both the Perfect and the Past Active Participle can express the influence of a preceding action on the level of background events, the latter is restricted to immediately preceding events, while the former can refer to any action which took place at any prior point on the time line. The PRAP and Imperfect function in a similar way on the level of background events.

On the level of background events, the various forms are not used indiscriminately. The Pluperfect and Perfect are distinguished from the Imperfect in that they lack the meaning of durative or repeated action, and in that they express actions which comment on or supplement foregrounded actions through the result -state they express (which, unlike the action itself, is temporally linked to a foregrounded event). Aspect and phase thus are

the determiners of the kind of connection that these events have with the main plot line. The two perfect tenses differ in their discourse contexts: in the prevailing past tense portion of the narrative, the Pluperfect is used; in quotations, reported speech or events, the Perfect is used because it is explicitly or implicitly contrasted to a prevailing present tense. When the auxiliary verb is absent, the l-participle, the remaining component of the perfect tenses, can take on a more timeless meaning, particularly under negation.

Both active participles are extensively used for backgrounding, and can be contrasted with the tensed forms mainly by their restricted use. They are normally linked to a tensed verb and supplement or amplify the meaning of latter. The subject is expressed once, usually in the clause containing the tensed verb, but not always. The participial forms are more common than tensed verbs on this level. When the participles are found in the Dative Absolute construction, they function slightly differently. Dative Absolutes invariably contain an expressed subject, normally different from the preceding clause. They may perform specialized functions of secondary predicates, such as fixing the time of a main clause event. They may also exhibit meanings similar to the non-Dative participles. Occasionally they are found in clusters, conveying foreground events. These clusters are somewhat anomalous, and may reflect the type of mistakes in usage expected for a form in decline. Alternatively, their use in foregrounding is suggestive of a possible marking of the peak level (the most significant event or sequence of events in the narrative), paralleling Jones and Jones finding for Kickapoo, in which peak is marked by a backgrounding tense/aspect

form.[1] This is a matter which a broader investigation could decide: the evidence of this source text alone does not justify such a conclusion.

The бъ-forms and Imperfects of быти, like all Imperfects, can be used on the level of background events. The бъ-form has also been used in the text with a passive participle to convey a Passive event on this level (three instances only). They express a background result-state resulting from a Passive event deeper in the Past. Thus the быти Aorist + passive participle expresses a "passivized Aorist" foreground event, while the бъ-form + passive participle expresses a "passivized Pluperfect" background event. In an occurrence just as rare (it is, of course, risky to generalize from such low frequencies) a быти Aorist passive can convey a Passive Perfect background event although this construction is more frequently used for foreground Passives.

A final example of how forms can jump levels is provided by the Pluperfect, when it expresses a highly significant event which is nonetheless not temporally in keeping with the plot line events to which it is adjacent in the story. Here, as in the preceding case of бъ-form Passive versus быти Passive, the position of the event itself on the plot line is more significant than the apparent importance of the event for the plot in choosing a grammatical form.

Aspect

As shown in the preceding chapters, the role of aspect in the grounding system is minimal. The tendency of the perfective aspect to associate a) with

[1]Larry B. Jones and Linda K. Jones, "Multiple levels of information in discourse," Discourse Studies in Mesoamerican Languages, (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1979), p.19.

(foreground) Aorists and b) with result-state producing Perfects and Pluperfects seems logical, but it is not a necessary meaning for plot advancement. Likewise, the imperfective aspect, which carries no obvious qualification for plot advancement, can nonetheless occur with plot-advancing verbs. The aspectual distinction does add meaning, but not the kind of meaning we need to have to position a form on one or the other level of grounding. With the demise of the tense system (that is, the system of varying preterite desinences, i.e. Aorist, Imperfect, Perfect, etc.) aspect became the obvious candidate to code grounding distinctions because of its close association with specific members of the former hierarchy. Time adverbials such as уже 'already' have been introduced to try and make up for the loss of distinctions in verbal morphology. Note that even in grounding, there is a healthy amount of subjectivity: the choice of foregrounding versus backgrounding form is, in a certain percentage of cases, a subjective choice.

Overall View

Table Two, a general outline of the three levels of foreground, background events, and deep background, shows us some interesting tendencies. Firstly, the parallel use of the Imperfect and Present Active Participle on the two background levels is not matched with a similar symmetry by the Aorist and Past Active Participle. This may be more of an illusion than an anomaly. In this rather limited study no attempt has been made to sketch a maximally accurate number of levels: such an attempt surely requires cross-textual comparison. It is important to bear in mind that the PRAP is always associated with another, tensed form; the Imperfect can occur independently. If we consider the PRAP to be in some way less

TABLE TWO

Morphological Expression of Discourse Levels and

Other Co-occurring Meanings in the Galician Chronicle

	Foreground *of great significance for the plot, advances the plot*	Background Events *amplifies, supplements foreground*	Deep Background *gives information, **not** linked to foreground*
General Usage	Aorist	Imperfect Dative Absolute	Imperfect
Restricted Usage		PRAP PAP	PRAP
Passive	Aorist-Passive	}(Aorist-Passive) } бъ-Passive	
Perfect Meaning		} Perfect Pluperfect	

prominent than the Imperfect, then it may well deserve to be on a separate, lower level.

Secondly, note that passive events are represented on both the foreground and background event levels, but in the latter case with the Perfect meaning because of its removal in time. (Though it must be admitted that the few instances do not provide a thoroughly solid basis for generalization.) It is important to bear in mind that passive and active participles may be combined to denote non-Perfect passive background events, although this phenomenon was not explored in the present thesis. Finally, note that the perfect tenses are on the level of background events only. That a perfect tense could express a foreground event would be illogical: if a result-state is a foreground event, then so will be the event that gave rise to it. When an event and its ensuing result-state are in the foreground, the need for a perfect form, whose very function is to deny the importance of the event, disappears.[2]

Historical Evolution

While the division of labour among the various forms seems rational, the lack of a place for the aspectual distinction may be its key weakness. When the elliptic Perfect takes on the semantic roles of the Aorist and Imperfect and the perfect meaning begins to be expressed, not by morphological, but by contextual means (including the inclusion of useful time adverbials where necessary), then the arrangement is simplified. The new all-purpose past tense appears in different positions on the chart

[2]Note, however, the use of the "Perfect of the recent past" (eg. "The Eagle has landed.") in English. This type, whose function is to underline the continuing relevance of an event not quite in the present, is not represented in this document.

according to the aspect used. The Dative Absolute, a high style construction, becomes obsolete: its specialized meanings are now conveyed by the addition of the correct subordinate conjunction; in its ordinary meanings on the background level it is replaced by either a деепричастие or the new "ordinary" backgrounding form, the imperfective preterite. The participles remain as indeclinable деепричастия. Thus, aspect takes its place in the grounding system of the language, which undergoes a radical simplification of the verbal morphology. The shift is from an overabundance of potential in verbal morphology to a more balanced system in which verbal morphology is assisted by contextual methods, including subordination.

Conclusions

The grounding functions of the various forms have thus been described and systematized. The Aorist is the foregrounding form while the Imperfect is the backgrounding form. The Perfect and Pluperfect are used for backgrounding when the result-state from a prior event is expressed. The participles can be used to supplement the other backgrounding forms. The Dative Absolute can be used with adverbial connotations as a backgrounding form and, rarely, for a cluster of foreground events. The possibilities for future research lie in four directions: to examine other documents and compare new findings with these ones, to investigate the possibility of a peak level and other foreground or background levels; to investigate other potential grounding tools, to determine all the possibilities for encoding grounding; and to shed more light on the intricate relationships between tense/aspect and other verb morphology on the one hand, and the encoding of grounding on the other.

Selected Bibliography

Belousov, V.N. "Istorija form soslagatel'nogo naklonenija." in Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Ed. by V.V. Ivanov, R.I. Avanesov. Moskva: Nauka, 1982, pp. 154-157.

Borkovskij, V. I. Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot: Prostoe predloženie. L'vov: L'vovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, 1949.

Borkovskij, V.I. Sintaxis drevnerusskix gramot: Složnoe predloženie. Moskva: Akademija nauk, 1958.

Borodič, V.V. "K voprosu o formirovanii soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida v slavjanskix jazykax," Voprosy jazykoznanija 2:6 (1953), pp. 68-86.

Dibrov, A.A., and V.S. Ovčinnikova. Očerki drevnerusskogo jazyka. Rostov-na-Donu: Rostovskij universitet, 1965.

Dostal, A. "K izučeniju kategorii glagola v staroslavjanskom jazyke." In Issledovanija po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo jazyka. Ed. by Josif Kurc. Praga: Čexoslovackoj Akademii Nauk, 1963.

Dostal, Antonin. Exerpt from Issledovanie o vidovoj sisteme staroslavjanskogo jazyka. In Jurij. S. Maslov, ed., Voprosy glagol'nogo vida. Moskva: Inostrannaja literatura, 1962.

Dostal, Antonín. Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnstině. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladateství, 1954.

Flier, Michael S. "The Alternation l - v in East Slavic." In American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists: Vol. I: Linguistics. Ed. by Michael S. Flier. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1983.

Forsyth, J. A Grammar of Aspect: Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

Georgieva, V.L. Istorija sintaktičeskix javlenij russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1968.

Hens'ors'kyj, A.I. Značennja form mynuloho času v Halyc'ko-Volyns'komu Litopysu. Kyïv: Akademija nauk ukraïns'koï R.S.R., 1957.

Hopper, Paul J. "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse." In Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 12. Discourse and Syntax. Ed. by Talmy Givon. New York: Academic Press, 1979, pp.213-241.

Ivanov, V.V. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. 2nd Ed. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1983.

Ivanov, V.V. "Istorija vremennyx form glagola" in Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Ed. by V.V. Ivanov, R.I. Avanesov. Moskva: Nauka, 1982, pp. 25-31.

Jakubinskij, L.P. Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1953.

Jones, Larry B., and Linda K. Jones. "Multiple levels of information in discourse." In Discourse Studies in Mesoamerican Languages, Vol. I, ed. by L.K. Jones. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1979, pp.3-27.

Kiparsky, Valentin. Russian Historical Grammar: Vol. 1: The Development of the Sound System. Revised by the author, translated by J.I. Press. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979.

Klenin, Emily. Review of Müller, Ludolf, below. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, XXVIII, 1983, pp. 181-185.

Kudrjavskij, D.H. "K statistike glagol'nyx form v Lavrent'evskoj letopisi." In Izvestija otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk. Vol. XIX, Part 2, pp. 48-54. Sanktpeterburg: Imperatorskaja akademija nauk, 1910. Reprinted Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-u. Verlaganstalt, 1965.

Kuz'mina, I.B., and Nemčenko, E. V. "Istorija pričastij" in Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Ed. by V.V. Ivanov, R.I. Avanesov. Moskva: Nauka, 1982, pp. 280-411.

Kuznecov, P.S. "Glagol." in Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka, 2nd ed. Ed. by V.I. Borkovskij and P.S. Kuznecov. Moskva: Nauka, 1965.

Kuznecov, P.S. Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Akademija nauk, 1959.

Lixačeva, O.P. "Galicko-Volynskaja letopis'." Translation and commentary by O.P. Lixačeva, in Pamjatniki literatury drevnej rusi: XIII vek. Ed. by L.A. Dmitriev and D.S. Lixačev. Moskva: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1981.

Lomtev, T.P. "O voznikovenii i razvitii parnoj korreljacii vnutri odnogo glagola po kategorii soveršennogo i nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke." In Sbornik statej po jazykoznaniju professory Moskovskogo universiteta akademiku V.V. Vinogradovu. Ed. by A.I. Efimov. Moskva: Moskovskij universitet, 1958.

Lopatina, L.E. "Vtorostepennoe skazuemoe." In Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie. Ed. by V.I. Borkovskij. Moskva: Nauka, 1978, pp. 102-118.

Lunt, Horace G. Old Church Slavonic Grammar, 6th ed. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Lysaght, T.A. Material towards the Compilation of a Concise Old Church Slavonic-English Dictionary. Wellington, New Zealand: 1978.

Matthews, W.K. Russian Historical Grammar. London: University of London Athlone Press, 1960.

Müller, Ludolf. Handbuch zur Nestorchronik: Band III: Vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis zur Nestorchronik. Munchen: Wilhelm Fink, 1977.

Nemec, Igor'. "Genezis slavjanskoj vidovoj sistemy." In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida. Ed. by Jurij. S. Maslov. Moskva: Inostrannaja literatura, 1962, pp. 265-275.

Nikol'skij, A. "O jazyke Ipatskoj letopisi," Russkij filologičeskij vestnik, (Warsaw, 1899), 41 (Nos. 1-2), pp. 238-275, and 42, (Nos. 3-4), pp. 23-110.

Ožegov, S.I. Slovar' russkogo jazyka. 13th ed. Ed. by N.J. Švedova. Moskva: Russkij jazyk, 1981.

Palamarčuk, L.S., and L.H. Skripnik, eds. Ukraïns'ko-Rosijs'kyj slovnik, 3rd Ed. Kyïv: Naukova Dumka, 1975.

Perfecky, George A. "Studies on the Galician-Volynian Chronicle." In The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States. XII:1-2, 1969-1972. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States Inc., pp. 62-112.

Perfecky, George A. The Hypatian Codex Part Two: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle. Translation by George A. Perfecky. Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, Vol. 16, II. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1973.

Pollack, Paul. "Evaluation of Opposing Influences of Church Slavonic and Old Russian in Texts of the 11th to 16th Centuries." In Melbourne Slavonic Studies No. 16. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1982.

Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej: Vol. II: Ipat'evskaja letopis'. S.-Peterburg", 1908. Reprinted Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura, 1962.

Potebnja, A.A. Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike. Vol. IV. Part II: Glagol. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1977.

Prokopovič, E. N. Glagol v predloženii. Semantika i stilistika vido-vremennyx form. Moskva: Nauka, 1982.

Prokopovič, E.N. "Glagol'noe skazuemoe." In Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie. Ed. by V.I. Borkovskij. Moskva: Nauka, 1978, pp. 41-73.

Ružička, Rudol'f. "Glagol'nij vid v "Povesti vremmenyx let." In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida. Ed. by Jurij. S. Maslov. Moskva: Inostrannaja literatura, 1962. pp. 308-319.

Sabenina, A.M. "Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj." In Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Sintaksis: Prostoe predloženie. Ed. by V.I. Borkovskij. Moskva: Nauka, 1978, pp. 417-432.

Samsonov, N.G. Drevnerusskij jazyk. Moskva: Vyssaja škola, 1973.

Schmalstieg, William R. An Introduction to Old Church Slavic, 2nd. ed. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1983.

Shevelov, George Y. A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979.

Slovník jazyka staroslověského. Lexicon linguae Paleoslavonicae. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd, 1966 (1958—).

Sreznevskij, I.I. Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka. Moskva, 1883, reprinted Moskva, 1958.

Taube, Moshe. "On the penetration of the Perfect into the Russian narrative system." Russian Linguistics 5:2. (December, 1980), pp. 121-131.

Tomlin, Russell S. "Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination." Text, 5:1-2, (1985), pp. 85-122.

Tomlin, Russell S. "On the interaction of syntactic subject, thematic information, and agent in English." Journal of Pragmatics 7, (1983), pp.411-432.

van Schooneveld, C.H. A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. 's-Gravenhague: Mouton, 1959.

van Wijk, Nicholas. "O proisxoždenii vidov slavjanskogo glagola." In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida. Ed. by Jurij. S. Maslov. Moskva: Inostrannaja literatura, 1962.

Vlasto, A.P. A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

Wheeler, Marcus. The Oxford Russian-English Dictionary, 2nd. ed. Ed. by Marcus Wheeler and B.O. Unbegaun. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Worth, Dean S. "Linguistics and historiography: a problem of dating in the Galician-Volhynian-Chronicle," Indiana Slavic Studies, III (1963), pp. 173-185.

Xaburgaev, G.A. Staroslavjanskij jazyk. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1974.